arXiv:1406.7781v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] 30 Jun 2014

On gradient field theories: gradient magnetostatics and gradient elasticity

Markus Lazar *

Heisenberg Research Group,
Department of Physics,
Darmstadt University of Technology,
Hochschulstr. 6,
D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany

July 1, 2014

Abstract

In this work the fundamentals of gradient field theories are presented and reviewed. In particular, the theories of gradient magnetostatics and gradient elasticity are investigated and compared. For gradient magnetostatics, non-singular expressions for the magnetic vector gauge potential, the Biot-Savart law, the Lorentz force and the mutual interaction energy of two electric current loops are derived and discussed. For gradient elasticity, non-singular forms of all dislocation key-formulas (Burgers equation, Mura equation, Peach-Koehler stress equation, Peach-Koehler force equation, and mutual interaction energy of two dislocation loops) are presented. In addition, similarities between an electric current loop and a dislocation loop are pointed out. The obtained fields for both gradient theories are non-singular due to a straightforward and self-consistent regularization.

Keywords: Gradient theories; gradient elasticity; gradient magnetostatics; dislocations; Green functions; size effects; regularization.

* *E-mail address:* lazar@fkp.tu-darmstadt.de (M. Lazar).

1 Introduction

Nowadays, gradient theories are very popular in physics, applied mathematics, material science and engineering science. Gradient theories are theories possessing internal length scales in order to describe size-effects. Such theories provide non-singular solutions of the field equations and therefore a regularization is achieved (e.g. a dislocation core regularization and an electron core regularization of the classical Dirac delta expressions). The principle concept of a gradient theory is simple; in addition to the "classical" state quantities, their gradient terms also have to be implemented in the Lagrangian density (or energy density). For a gradient theory of order n, the Lagrangian density depends on all the gradients of the state quantities up to order n. From that point of view, gradient theories are effective theories.

In physics, the most popular gradient theory is the so-called Bopp-Podolsky theory, which is the gradient version of the theory of electrodynamics. Bopp [1] and Podolsky [2] have proposed theories representing generalizations of the theory of electrodynamics to linear field equations of fourth-order in order to avoid singularities in electrodynamics (see also [3, 4, 5]). Such a generalized electrodynamics has a physical meaning if the (static) electric potential becomes the Coulomb potential asymptotically, and if the point-like field sources have a Dirac delta form [6]. The Bopp-Podolsky theory has many interesting features. It solves the problem of infinite energy in the electrostatic case, and it gives the correct expression for the self-force of charged particles at short distances eliminating the singularity when $r \to 0$ as shown by Frenkel [7]. In this manner, the Bopp-Podolsky electrodynamics is free of divergences. Another important prediction of the Bopp-Podolsky theory is that the value of an electron core radius is proportional to a parameter a, the so-called Bopp-Podolsky parameter. These features allow experiments that could test the generalized electrodynamics as a viable effective field theory (e.g., [8]). Iwanenko and Sokolow [4] and Kvasnica [9] argued that the Bopp-Podolsky parameter a is in the order of $\sim 10^{-13}$ cm. From a historical point of view, it is mentioned that in the sixties Feynman [10] has never appreciated the usefulness and power of the Bopp-Podolsky theory. The sixties were a time when physicists were usually more interested in quantum theories. However, the Bopp-Podolsky model has a close relationship with the Pauli-Villars regularization procedure used in quantum electrodynamics (see, e.g., [11, 12]). In this way, the Bopp-Podolsky theory serves a "physical" regularization method based on higher-order partial differential equations.

It should be mentioned that one can find in the literature (e.g., [13]) that the classical theory of Maxwell's electrodynamics and Einstein's theory of gravity (general relativity) are gradient theories. However, both theories do not possess characteristic length scales. No classical theories exist such that the theories of electrodynamics and of general relativity could be considered as their gradient version. Moreover, the electromagnetic potentials are gauge fields and are not gauge invariant, and therefore they are not state quantities. Only the electromagnetic field strengths are state quantities, reiterating Maxwell's theory of "classical" electrodynamics, and therefore the corresponding gradient theory is the Bopp-Podolsky theory.

More than twenty years after the Bopp-Podolsky theory, Mindlin [14] (see also [15, 16, 17, 18, 19]) introduced theories of gradient elasticity however without giving any

credit to Bopp and Podolsky. In order to remove the singularities in the classical solutions, such continuum theories of generalized elasticity may be used. The correspondence between the gradient elasticity theory and the atomic structure of materials with the nearest and next nearest interatomic interactions was exhibited by Toupin and Grazis [20]. The original Mindlin theory [14, 15] possesses many additional material parameters. For isotropic materials, Mindlin's theory of first strain gradient elasticity [14, 15] possesses two characteristic lengths. The discrete nature of materials is inherently incorporated in the formulation through the characteristic lengths. One can say that gradient elasticity is a continuum theory valid on small scales. The capability of strain gradient theories in capturing size effects is a direct manifestation of the involvement of characteristic lengths. Lardner [21] was the first who investigated straight screw and edge dislocations in the framework of Mindlin's gradient elasticity theory. Since considering neither plastic distortion nor dislocation density, Lardner [21] constructed actually solutions for a compatible boundary value problem, which are still singular.

Simplified versions, which are particular cases of Mindlin's theories, have been proposed and used in the literature. A simplified gradient elasticity theory is gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type [22, 23, 24], with only one material length scale parameter as new material coefficient. The theory of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type is a special version of Mindlin's gradient elasticity theory [14]. Using ab initio calculations, Shodja et al. [25] found that the characteristic length scale parameters of first strain gradient elasticity are of the order $\ell \sim 10^{-10}$ m for several fcc and bcc materials. Therefore, gradient elasticity can be used for understanding the nano-mechanical phenomena at such length scales.

Non-singular fields of straight dislocations and dislocation loops were obtained in the framework of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type by Lazar and Maugin [22, 26] and Lazar [27, 24], respectively. Lazar [27, 24] derived the non-singular dislocation key-formulas (Burgers formula, Mura formula and Peach-Koehler stress formula) valid in gradient elasticity. Such non-singular solutions of arbitrary dislocations might be very useful for the so-called discrete dislocation dynamics (e.g., [28, 29]). Since dislocations are the basic carriers of plasticity, the fundamental physics of plastic deformation must be described in terms of the behavior of dislocation ensembles. Lazar and Maugin [26] have shown that, for straight dislocations, the gradient parameter leads to a smoothing of the displacement profile, in contrast to the jump occurring in the classical solution. Lazar [30] has extended gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type for functionally graded materials and an analytical solution of a screw dislocation in such a material was given.

Gradient elasticity with only one gradient parameter can be found in the literature also under the names dipolar gradient elasticity theory [31, 32], simplified strain gradient elasticity theory [33, 34] and special gradient elasticity theory [35]. Useful applications of such a gradient elasticity theory are for example cracks (e.g., [31]) as well as the Eshelby inclusion problem (e.g., [33, 34]). However, the framework of Altan and Aifantis [35] and Gutkin and Aifantis [36, 37] lacks double stresses and is not based on proper variational considerations (e.g. to obtain pertinent boundary conditions). It is remarkable that Günther [38] was the first who spoke of a mechanical model of the Bopp-Podolsky potential for defects in elasticity. Like the Bopp-Podolsky theory, gradient elasticity theory of Helmholtz type serves a "physical" regularization based on higher-order partial

differential equations. A nice overview on gradient theories in physics (superconductivity, radiative fluid dynamics, theory of dielectrics, and surface phenomena) was given by Maugin [39].

The aim of this paper is to present a comparison between the magnetostatic Bopp-Podolsky theory and the theory of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. Similarities and differences for these theories are pointed out. In addition, we derive new key-equations for both gradient theories. For electric current loops, the Biot-Savart law, the Lorentz force, and the mutual interaction energy are derived, for the first time, in the framework of gradient magnetostatics. For dislocation loops, all the dislocation key-formulas (Burgers equation, Mura equation, Peach-Koehler stress equation, Peach-Koehler force equation, mutual interaction energy) are calculated using gradient elasticity. Moreover, following the analogy between "classical" magnetostatics and "classical" dislocation theory pointed out by deWit [40], we investigate the analogy between gradient magnetostatics and dislocations in gradient elasticity. We consider in both theories an infinite continuum, therefore there is no need for boundary conditions. For completeness, boundary conditions are given in the Appendix B. Moreover, we decompose the boundary conditions into the classical part and the gradient part and we also give a physical interpretation of them.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the fundamentals of gradient theory of magnetostatics are presented and the Biot-Savart law, the Lorentz force, and the mutual interaction energy are calculated. The "Bifield" ansatz for gradient magnetostatics [1, 2] is used for the decomposition of magnetic fields into the classical part and a purely gradient part. In Section 3, the theory of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type is reviewed and investigated. Dislocations are examined in the framework of gradient elasticity. A "Ru-Aifantis theorem" is generalized for dislocations in an infinite medium in the framework of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. In addition, a "Bifield" ansatz for gradient elasticity is introduced and used for the decomposition of fields into the classical part and a purely gradient part. All dislocation key-formulas valid in gradient elasticity are given. The presentation of the two gradient theories reveals the similarities and differences between them. In Section 4, the final conclusions are given. Some mathematical and technical details and a discussion of the boundary conditions are presented in the Appendices.

2 Gradient magnetostatics – Bopp-Podolsky theory

In this section, we investigate the gradient theory of magnetostatics which is the magnetostatic part of the Bopp-Podolsky theory [1, 2]. In such a theory of gradient magnetostatics, the energy density takes the form

$$W = \frac{1}{2\mu_0} B_i B_i + \frac{1}{2\mu_0} a^2 \partial_k B_i \partial_k B_i - A_k J_k \,, \tag{1}$$

where B_i denotes the magnetic field vector (or magnetic induction), μ_0 is the permeability of vacuum, a is taken to be a fundamental constant with dimension of length, J_k is the electric current density vector and A_k denotes the magnetic vector gauge potential. The magnetic field vector may be expressed in terms of the magnetic vector gauge potential

$$B_i = \epsilon_{ijk} \partial_j A_k \,, \tag{2}$$

satisfying the Bianchi identify

$$\partial_i B_i = 0\,, \tag{3}$$

which means that magnetic monopoles do not exist. Here, ϵ_{ikl} denotes the Levi-Civita tensor.

From Eq. (1), two kinds of excitation fields can be defined

$$H_i = \frac{\partial W}{\partial B_i} = \mu_0^{-1}\, B_i\,, \tag{4}$$

$$H_{ik} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_k B_i)} = a^2 \mu_0^{-1}\, \partial_k B_i = a^2 \partial_k H_i\,, \tag{5}$$

where H_i is the magnetic excitation vector and H_{ik} is the magnetic excitation tensor, which is a higher-order excitation field. It can be seen in Eq. (5) that H_{ik} is just the gradient of H_i and multiplied by a^2. From Eqs. (3)–(5), it follows: $\partial_i H_i = 0$ and $\partial_i H_{ik} = 0$. In addition, it yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial B_i\, \partial B_i} = \frac{1}{\mu_0}\,, \qquad \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial(\partial_k B_i)\, \partial(\partial_k B_i)} = \frac{a^2}{\mu_0}\,. \tag{6}$$

Using a variational principle with respect to the magnetic vector gauge potential A_i, the Euler-Lagrange equation is given by (e.g., [4])

$$\frac{\delta W}{\delta A_i} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial A_i} - \partial_j \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_j A_i)} + \partial_k \partial_j \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_k \partial_j A_i)} = 0\,. \tag{7}$$

By means of Eqs. (1), (4) and (5), the Euler-Lagrange equation (7) reduces to

$$\epsilon_{ijk} \partial_j \big(H_k - \partial_l H_{kl}\big) = J_i\,. \tag{8}$$

Using Eq. (5), Eq. (8) can be simplified to

$$L \epsilon_{ijk} \partial_j H_k = J_i \tag{9}$$

with the Helmholtz operator L depending on the length scale a

$$L = 1 - a^2 \Delta\,, \tag{10}$$

where $\Delta = \partial_i \partial_i$ denotes the Laplacian. Eqs. (8) and (9) are the Ampère law valid in gradient magnetostatics. Eqs. (3) and (9) are the field equations for gradient magnetostatics. The field equation (9) is a partial differential equation (pde) of 3rd-order for the field[1] H_k. In addition, the current vector satisfies the continuity equation

$$\partial_i J_i = 0\,. \tag{11}$$

[1] A more general constitutive relation than Eq. (5) is $H_{ik} = c_1 \partial_k B_i + c_2 \partial_i B_k$, since $\delta_{ik} \partial_l B_l = 0$. Using Eq. (3), it does not change the Euler-Lagrange equation (8), due to $\partial_l H_{kl} = c_1 \Delta B_k$, and $c_1 = a^2 \mu_0^{-1}$. Therefore, gradient magnetostatics possesses in a natural way only one internal length scale parameter, namely a.

Taking the curl of Eq. (9) and using $\partial_i H_i = 0$, it can be written in the form of an inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Laplace equation (pde of 4th-order)

$$L\Delta H_i = -\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j J_k \,. \tag{12}$$

Using Eqs. (2) and (4), Eq. (9) reduces to a field equation for the magnetic vector gauge potential (pde of 4th-order)

$$L(\partial_i\partial_k - \delta_{ik}\Delta)A_k = \mu_0\, J_i \,. \tag{13}$$

If the Coulomb gauge condition, which is a side condition, is used for the magnetic vector gauge potential A_k,

$$\partial_k A_k = 0 \,, \tag{14}$$

or the generalized Coulomb gauge condition

$$L\partial_k A_k = 0 \,, \tag{15}$$

then the magnetic vector gauge potential A_k satisfies the following inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Laplace equation which is a pde of 4th-order for A_k

$$L\Delta A_k = -\mu_0\, J_k \,. \tag{16}$$

The formal solution of Eq. (16) is given as convolution

$$A_k = -\mu_0\, G * J_k \,, \tag{17}$$

where $*$ denotes the spatial convolution and G denotes here the Green function of the Helmholtz-Laplace equation and is defined by

$$L\Delta G = \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}') \,. \tag{18}$$

The three-dimensional solution of the Green function of the Helmholtz-Laplace equation reads

$$G(R) = -\frac{1}{4\pi R}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right), \tag{19}$$

where $R = |\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}'|$. Eq. (19) represents the regularized Green function in the static Bopp-Podolsky theory and $G(0) = -1/[4\pi a]$. Using Eq. (17) and the property of the differentiation of a convolution [41, 42], it can be seen that the Coulomb gauge condition (14) is fulfilled as a consequence of the continuity equation (11)

$$\partial_k A_k = -\mu_0\, \partial_k (G * J_k) = -\mu_0\, G * (\partial_k J_k) = 0 \,. \tag{20}$$

The substitution of Eq. (19) into Eq. (17) gives the solution for the magnetic vector gauge potential

$$A_k = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\int_V \frac{1}{R}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right) J_k(\boldsymbol{x}')\, dV' \,, \tag{21}$$

which vanishes at infinity. Using Eqs. (2) and (21), the magnetic field vector is calculated as

$$B_i = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \int_V \epsilon_{ijk} \frac{R_j}{R^3} \left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{R}{a} \right) \mathrm{e}^{-R/a} \right] J_k(\boldsymbol{x}') \, dV' \,, \tag{22}$$

which is the general Biot-Savart law for a volume current J_k valid in gradient magnetostatics. Eq. (22) determines the non-singular magnetostatic field of a current distribution $J_k(\boldsymbol{x}')$. Here, $\boldsymbol{R} = \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}'$ denotes the relative radius vector. In the limit $a \to 0$, Eqs. (21) and (22) reduce to the "classical" results of magnetostatics (see, e.g., [43, 44]). The fields (21) and (22) are non-singular.

If J_k is the "true" electric current, we may introduce a so-called "free" electric current J'_k (or "effective" electric current) by

$$J_k = L J'_k \,. \tag{23}$$

Then the field equations (12) and (16) are modified to

$$L \Delta H_i = -\epsilon_{ijk} \partial_j L J'_k \,, \tag{24}$$

$$L \Delta A_k = -\mu_0 \, L J'_k \,. \tag{25}$$

Alternatively, the field equation (9), which is a pde of 3rd-order, may be rewritten as an analogous system of pdes, namely one of 1st-order and another one of 2nd-order,

$$\epsilon_{ijk} \partial_j H^0_k = J_i \,, \tag{26}$$

$$L H_k = H^0_k \,. \tag{27}$$

In addition, it yields

$$H^0_i = \mu_0^{-1} \, B^0_i \,, \tag{28}$$

and

$$B^0_i = \epsilon_{ijk} \partial_j A^0_k \,. \tag{29}$$

The corresponding Bianchi identity reads

$$\partial_i B^0_i = 0 \,. \tag{30}$$

2.1 Bifield-Ansatz

Since the Bopp-Podolsky theory is a generalization of the classical electrodynamics, the question arises how the classical fields can be separated from the generalized fields. The considered type of linear theory possesses the interesting property that the field A_k might be represented as a superposition of two other fields (the so-called "Bifield")

$$A_k = A^0_k + A^1_k \,, \tag{31}$$

satisfying the following equations of second-order (e.g., [4, 5]). Since A_k^0 satisfies an inhomogeneous Laplace equation (or Poisson equation)

$$\Delta A_k^0 = -\mu_0 \, J_k \,, \tag{32}$$

A_k^0 may be identified with the classical magnetic vector gauge potential. A_k^1 is the part of the magnetic gauge potential depending on the parameter a and, therefore, it is called the gradient part. In addition, A_k fulfills the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation

$$L A_k = A_k^0 \,, \tag{33}$$

and the Poisson equation

$$a^2 \Delta A_k = A_k^1 \,. \tag{34}$$

Substituting Eq. (31) into Eq. (33) and using Eq. (32), we obtain for the gradient part A_k^1 the following equation

$$L A_k^1 = a^2 \Delta A_k^0 = -\mu_0 \, a^2 J_k \,. \tag{35}$$

Thus, the field A_k^0 satisfies an inhomogeneous Laplace equation and the field A_k^1 satisfies an inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation. In both cases, the source field is J_k. Using Eq. (33), the generalized Coulomb gauge condition (15) reduces to the Coulomb gauge condition for A_k^0

$$L \partial_k A_k = \partial_k A_k^0 = 0 \,. \tag{36}$$

Also for the magnetic excitation vector field H_k, we may make a "Bifield" ansatz:

$$H_k = H_k^0 + H_k^1 \,, \tag{37}$$

where H_k^0 fulfills the following Poisson equation

$$\Delta H_k^0 = -\epsilon_{kji} \partial_j J_i \,. \tag{38}$$

In addition to Eqs. (26) and (27), the following equations hold

$$L H_k^1 = a^2 \Delta H_k^0 = -a^2 \epsilon_{kji} \partial_j J_i \,, \tag{39}$$

$$a^2 \Delta H_k = H_k^1 \,, \tag{40}$$

as well as

$$H_k^1 = \partial_i H_{ki} \,. \tag{41}$$

A "Bifield" ansatz for the magnetic field vector B_k is given by

$$B_k = B_k^0 + B_k^1 \,, \tag{42}$$

where B_k^0 satisfies the following Poisson equation

$$\Delta B_k^0 = -\mu_0 \epsilon_{kji} \partial_j J_i \tag{43}$$

and the equations

$$\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j B_k^0 = \mu_0\, J_i\,, \tag{44}$$

$$LB_k = B_k^0\,, \tag{45}$$

as well as

$$LB_k^1 = a^2\Delta B_k^0 = -\mu_0 a^2 \epsilon_{kji}\partial_j J_i\,, \tag{46}$$

$$a^2\Delta B_k = B_k^1\,. \tag{47}$$

Using the "Bifield"-ansatz, the regularized Green function (19) can be decomposed into two parts

$$G = G^0 + G^1\,, \tag{48}$$

where

$$G^0 = -\frac{1}{4\pi R}\,, \qquad G^1 = \frac{1}{4\pi R}\,\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\,, \tag{49}$$

satisfying the following equations of second-order

$$\Delta G^0 = \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\,. \tag{50}$$

Here G^0 is the Green function of the Laplace operator and G^1 is the Green function of the Helmholtz operator. In addition, G fulfills the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation

$$LG = G^0\,, \tag{51}$$

and the Poisson equation

$$a^2\Delta G = G^1\,. \tag{52}$$

Substituting Eq. (48) into Eq. (51) and using Eq. (49), we obtain for the gradient part G^1 the following equation

$$LG^1 = a^2\Delta G^0 = a^2\delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\,. \tag{53}$$

Therefore, the regularized Green function G, which is the Green function of the Helmholtz-Laplace operator, can be represented as a superposition of the Green functions of the Laplace and Helmholtz operators. On the other hand, it follows from Eqs. (51)–(53) that G can be written as the convolution of the Green functions of the Laplace and Helmholtz operators into the following way

$$G = \frac{1}{a^2}\, G^1 * G^0\,, \tag{54}$$

satisfying

$$L\Delta G = \frac{1}{a^2}\, L\Delta(G^1 * G^0) = \frac{1}{a^2}\,(LG^1) * (\Delta G^0) = \delta * (\Delta G^0) = \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\,, \tag{55}$$

where Eqs. (50) and (53) have been used.

Thus, A_k^0, H_k^0, B_k^0 and G^0 are the classical fields (or Maxwell fields) and the fields A_k^1, H_k^1, B_k^1 and G^1 are the gradients parts which are the non-classical fields (or static Proca or Yukawa fields) depending on the parameter a.

2.2 An electric current loop and the Biot-Savart law

We consider a closed electric circuit C carrying the steady current I. The electric current vector density ("true current") of such a closed loop is given by

$$J_k = I\,\delta_k(C) = I\oint_C \delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}')\,dl'_k\,. \tag{56}$$

Here, $\delta_j(C)$ is the Dirac delta function for a closed curve C. Substituting Eq. (56) into Eq. (21), the magnetic vector gauge potential of a closed loop is

$$A_k = \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\oint_C \frac{1}{R}\Big(1-\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\Big)\,dl'_k\,. \tag{57}$$

It is important to note that the field (57) is non-singular. According to the "Bifield" ansatz (31) the magnetic vector gauge potential (57) may be decomposed into the classical part

$$A^0_k = \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\oint_C \frac{1}{R}\,dl'_k \tag{58}$$

and the gradient part

$$A^1_k = -\frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\oint_C \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}}{R}\,dl'_k\,. \tag{59}$$

Both A^0_k and A^1_k are singular. In general, the field $A_k = A^0_k + A^1_k$ which is the sum of a long-ranging "Coulomb-like" field A^0_k and a short-ranging "Yukawa-like" field A^1_k is non-singular.

For a closed electric current loop, the Biot-Savart law valid in gradient magnetostatics is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} B_i &= \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\,\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j\oint_C \frac{1}{R}\Big(1-\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\Big)\,dl'_k \\ &= -\frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\oint_C \epsilon_{ijk}\,\frac{R_j}{R^3}\left[1-\left(1+\frac{R}{a}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right]dl'_k\,. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Note that this field is finite in the whole space. Eq. (60) represents the magnetic field vector of a current loop valid in the Bopp-Podolsky theory. In the limit $a\to 0$, Eqs. (57) and (60) reduce to the "classical" results of magnetostatics (see, e.g., [43, 45, 44]). According to the "Bifield" ansatz (42) the magnetic field vector (60) might be decomposed into the classical part

$$B^0_i = -\frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\oint_C \epsilon_{ijk}\,\frac{R_j}{R^3}\,dl'_k \tag{61}$$

and the gradient part

$$B^1_i = \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi}\oint_C \epsilon_{ijk}\,\frac{R_j}{R^3}\left(1+\frac{R}{a}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\,dl'_k\,. \tag{62}$$

Both the long-ranging field B_i^0 and the short-ranging field B_i^1 are singular. However, the superposition $B_i = B_i^0 + B_i^1$ is non-singular.

From the point of view of the magnetic field (60), the electric current is not anymore a δ-string; the real electric current with "core spreading" is obtained by inserting Eq. (56) into Eq. (23)

$$J'_k = \frac{\mu_0\, I}{4\pi a^2} \oint_C \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}}{R}\, dl'_k\,. \tag{63}$$

The Bopp-Podolsky length a has the meaning of the region in which non-local interaction is of fundamental importance.

The Lorentz force between an electric current $\boldsymbol{J}^{(A)}$ and a magnetic field $\boldsymbol{B}^{(B)}$ is given by (e.g., [46, 47])

$$F_m^{(AB)} = \int_V \epsilon_{mli}\, B_i^{(B)}\, J_l^{(A)}\, dV\,. \tag{64}$$

If we substitute the electric current (56) of a loop $C^{(A)}$ and the magnetic field (60) of a loop $C^{(B)}$, we obtain the interaction force between two loops $C^{(A)}$ and $C^{(B)}$

$$F_m^{(AB)} = -\frac{\mu_0\, I^{(A)} I^{(B)}}{4\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \epsilon_{mli}\epsilon_{ijk}\, \frac{R_j}{R^3}\left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{R}{a}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right] dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_l^{(A)}\,, \tag{65}$$

where $\boldsymbol{R} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(A)} - \boldsymbol{x}^{(B)}$. Eq. (65) can be simplified and the force on a loop $C^{(A)}$ exerted by a loop $C^{(B)}$ is

$$F_j^{(AB)} = -\frac{\mu_0\, I^{(A)} I^{(B)}}{4\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \frac{R_j}{R^3}\left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{R}{a}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right] dl_i^{(B)}\, dl_i^{(A)}\,. \tag{66}$$

It follows that $F_j^{(AB)} = -F_j^{(BA)}$. Thus, it can be seen that the interaction force between two current loops is non-singular in gradient magnetostatics.

Using the identity (see also [48])

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_V \left(B_i H_i + a^2 \partial_k B_i \partial_k H_i\right) dV &= \int_V B_i\, LH_i\, dV + \text{div-term} \\
&= \int_V \left(\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j A_k\right) LH_i\, dV \\
&= \int_V A_k \left(\epsilon_{kji}\partial_j LH_i\right) dV \\
&= \int_V A_k J_k\, dV\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where we have used that the surface term vanishes at infinity, Eq. (2), partial integration, and the field equation (9), we finally obtain the formula for the interaction energy between a current $\boldsymbol{J}^{(A)}$ and the magnetic vector gauge potential $\boldsymbol{A}^{(B)}$:

$$W^{(AB)} = \int_V A_k^{(B)}\, J_k^{(A)}\, dV\,. \tag{68}$$

If we substitute the electric current (56) of a loop $C^{(A)}$ and the magnetic vector gauge potential (57) of a loop $C^{(B)}$, we find for the interaction energy between two loops $C^{(A)}$ and $C^{(B)}$

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(AB)} &= I^{(A)} \oint_{C^{(A)}} A_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \\ &= \frac{\mu_0\, I^{(A)} I^{(B)}}{4\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \frac{1}{R} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right) dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

This is the non-singular mutual interaction energy between two current loops. In the limit $a \to 0$, Eq. (69) reduces to the "classical" singular result of magnetostatics (see, e.g., [43, 45]). If we define the mutual inductance between the loops $C^{(A)}$ and $C^{(B)}$ in gradient magnetostatics by

$$M^{(AB)} = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \frac{1}{R} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/a}\right) dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \,, \tag{70}$$

the interaction energy (69) can be written as

$$W^{(AB)} = I^{(A)} I^{(B)} M^{(AB)} \,. \tag{71}$$

It follows that $M^{(AB)} = M^{(BA)}$. Eq. (70) is a purely geometric quantity, which is the Neumann equation valid in gradient magnetostatics. The self-energy of an electric current loop can be found by using the same curve for $C^{(A)}$ and $C^{(B)}$, and inserting a factor $\frac{1}{2}$, so that, $W^{(AA)} = \frac{1}{2}\, I^{(A)} I^{(A)} M^{(AA)}$, where $M^{(AA)}$ is the self-inductance.

3 Gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type

In this section, we investigate the theory of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. The strain energy density of gradient elasticity theory of Helmholtz type for an isotropic, linearly elastic material has the form [22, 33, 27, 24]

$$W = \frac{1}{2}\, C_{ijkl} \beta_{ij} \beta_{kl} + \frac{1}{2}\, \ell^2 C_{ijkl} \partial_m \beta_{ij} \partial_m \beta_{kl} \,, \tag{72}$$

where the tensor of the elastic moduli C_{ijkl} is given by

$$C_{ijkl} = \mu\big(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}\big) + \lambda\, \delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} \,. \tag{73}$$

Here, μ and λ are the Lamé moduli and β_{ij} denotes the elastic distortion tensor[2]. If the elastic distortion tensor is incompatible, it can be decomposed as follows

$$\beta_{ij} = \partial_j u_i - \beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P}} \,, \tag{74}$$

where u_i and β_{ij}^{P} denote the displacement vector and the plastic distortion tensor, respectively. In addition, ℓ is the material length scale parameter of gradient elasticity of

[2] Due to an existing confusion in the literature, it is noted that β_{ij} is the elastic distortion tensor of gradient elasticity and it should not be confused with the elastic distortion tensor β_{ij}^{0} of classical elasticity.

Helmholtz type. For dislocations, ℓ is related to the size of the dislocation core. The condition for non-negative strain energy density, $W \geq 0$, gives for the material moduli the following relations

$$(2\mu + 3\lambda) \geq 0\,, \qquad \mu \geq 0\,, \qquad \ell^2 \geq 0\,. \tag{75}$$

Defects like dislocations may be the reason that the elastic and plastic distortion tensors are incompatible. Since dislocations cause self-stresses, body forces are zero. The dislocation density tensor can be defined in terms of the elastic and plastic distortion tensors as follows (e.g., [49])

$$\alpha_{ij} = \epsilon_{jkl}\partial_k\beta_{il}\,, \tag{76}$$

$$\alpha_{ij} = -\epsilon_{jkl}\partial_k\beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{il}\,, \tag{77}$$

which fulfills the following Bianchi identity

$$\partial_j\alpha_{ij} = 0\,. \tag{78}$$

It means that dislocations do not end inside the body. From Eq. (77) it can be seen that the plastic distortion tensor, which plays the role of eigendeformation and eigenstrain, cannot be neglected for dislocations.

From Eq. (72) it follows that the corresponding constitutive relations are

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial \beta_{ij}} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial e_{ij}} = C_{ijkl}\beta_{kl} = C_{ijkl}e_{kl}\,, \tag{79}$$

$$\tau_{ijk} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_k\beta_{ij})} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_k e_{ij})} = \ell^2\, C_{ijmn}\partial_k\beta_{mn} = \ell^2\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\,. \tag{80}$$

Here, $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ji}$ is the Cauchy stress tensor[3], $\tau_{ijk} = \tau_{jik}$ is the so-called double stress tensor, and $e_{ij} = 1/2(\beta_{ij} + \beta_{ji})$ is the elastic strain tensor (see also [18, 19, 22, 24, 34, 55]). Using Eqs. (79) and (80), Eq. (72) can also be written as [22]

$$W = \frac{1}{2}\,\sigma_{ij}e_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}\,\ell^2\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\partial_k e_{ij}\,. \tag{81}$$

It is obvious that the strain energy density (81) exhibits a "stress-strain" symmetry both in σ_{ij} and e_{ij} and in $\partial_k\sigma_{ij}$ and $\partial_k e_{ij}$. In addition, it yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial e_{ij}\,\partial e_{kl}} = C_{ijkl}\,, \qquad \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial(\partial_m e_{ij})\,\partial(\partial_m e_{kl})} = \ell^2 C_{ijkl}\,. \tag{82}$$

[3] In order to avoid the existing confusion and non-unique terminology in the literature of gradient elasticity (e.g., [50, 51, 52, 53]), it has to be noted that σ_{ij} and e_{ij} are the Cauchy stress tensor and the elastic strain tensor of gradient elasticity and they should not be confused with the Cauchy stress tensor σ^0_{ij} and the elastic strain tensor e^0_{ij} of classical elasticity. On the other hand, Georgiadis et al. [32] used the notation of monopolar stress tensor for σ_{ij} and dipolar stress tensor for τ_{ijk}. Georgiadis and Grentzelou [54] used the terminology: σ_{ij} is the monopolar (or Cauchy in the nomenclature of Mindlin [14]) stress tensor and τ_{ijk} is the dipolar (or double) stress tensor.

Using a variational principle, the Euler-Lagrange equation reads for gradient elasticity (see, e.g., [56, 57, 58, 59])

$$\frac{\delta W}{\delta u_i} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} - \partial_j \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_j u_i)} + \partial_k \partial_j \frac{\partial W}{\partial(\partial_k \partial_j u_i)} = 0 \,. \tag{83}$$

For vanishing body forces and using the constitutive relations (79) and (80), the Euler-Lagrange equation (83) takes the following form in terms of the Cauchy and double stress tensors (e.g., [14])

$$\partial_j(\sigma_{ij} - \partial_k \tau_{ijk}) = 0 \,. \tag{84}$$

Using the relation that the double stress tensor is the gradient of the Cauchy stress tensor in Eq. (80), then Eq. (84) reduces to (e.g., [24])

$$L\partial_j \sigma_{ij} = 0 \,, \tag{85}$$

where now

$$L = 1 - \ell^2 \Delta \tag{86}$$

is the Helmholtz operator, depending on the gradient length scale ℓ. It is interesting to note that the equilibrium condition (85) is similar in the form to the generalized Coulomb gauge condition (15).

If we substitute the constitutive relation (79) and Eq. (74) into the equilibrium condition (85), we obtain the following inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Navier equation for the displacement vector $\boldsymbol{u}$

$$LL_{ik} u_k = C_{ijkl} \partial_j L \beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{kl} \,, \tag{87}$$

where $L_{ik} = C_{ijkl}\partial_j \partial_l$ is the differential operator of the Navier equation. For an isotropic material, it reads

$$L_{ik} = \mu \, \delta_{ik} \Delta + (\mu + \lambda) \, \partial_i \partial_k \,. \tag{88}$$

Eq. (87) is nothing but the equilibrium condition (85) written in terms of the displacement vector $\boldsymbol{u}$ and the plastic distortion tensor $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P}}$. From Eq. (87) we can also derive an inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Navier equation for the elastic distortion tensor $\boldsymbol{\beta}$

$$LL_{ik} \beta_{km} = -C_{ijkl} \epsilon_{mlr} \partial_j L \alpha_{kr} \,, \tag{89}$$

where the dislocation density tensor $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is the source field. It is interesting to note that Eqs. (87) and (89) have a similar form as Eq. (24).

On the other hand, adopting the so-called "Ru-Aifantis theorem" [60] in terms of stresses, Eq. (85) can be written as an equivalent system of two equations, namely

$$\partial_j \sigma^0_{ij} = 0 \,, \tag{90}$$

$$L\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^0_{ij} \,, \tag{91}$$

where σ_{ij}^0 is the classical Cauchy stress tensor (sometimes also called "total stress" tensor [61, 62, 63, 50] or the "polarization" of the stress σ_{ij} [17]). Although, Vardoulakis et al. [62] and Exadaktylos [63] called the stress σ_{ij}^0 as total stress tensor in the framework of gradient elasticity, their obtained mode-III and mode-I crack solutions for σ_{ij}^0 do not depend on the gradient parameter ℓ. In fact, using gradient elasticity, the solution for the stress σ_{ij}^0 of a mode-III crack [62] agrees with the mode-III crack solution given by Altan and Aifantis [64, 35] in the framework of gradient elasticity. However, as it is already mentioned by Altan and Aifantis [64, 35], the solution of the stress of the mode-III crack is the same as the stress field of a mode-III crack in the classical theory of elasticity and it is singular at the crack tip. In addition, in a formal sense, Eqs. (90) and (91) are similar to Eqs. (36) and (33), respectively. Therefore, the tensor σ_{ij}^0 should be identified with the classical stress tensor.

As shown by Lazar and Maugin [22, 26], the following Helmholtz equations (pdes of 2nd-order) for the elastic distortion tensor, the displacement vector, the plastic distortion tensor, and the dislocation density tensor can be derived from the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation (91)

$$L\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ij}^0 \,, \tag{92}$$

$$Lu_i = u_i^0 \,, \tag{93}$$

$$L\beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P}} = \beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P},0} \,, \tag{94}$$

$$L\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ij}^0 \,, \tag{95}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^0$, $\boldsymbol{u}^0$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P},0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$ are the corresponding classical fields. Note that the fields $\boldsymbol{\beta}^0$, $\boldsymbol{u}^0$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P},0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$ are singular and they are the sources in the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equations (92)–(95). Using the Helmholtz equations (94) and (95), the Helmholtz-Navier equations (87) and (89) can be simplified to the following inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Navier equations (pdes of 4th-order)

$$LL_{ik}u_k = C_{ijkl}\partial_j\beta_{kl}^{\mathrm{P},0} \,, \tag{96}$$

$$LL_{ik}\beta_{km} = -C_{ijkl}\epsilon_{mlr}\partial_j\alpha_{kr}^0 \,, \tag{97}$$

where now the classical plastic distortion tensor $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P},0}$ and the classical dislocation density tensor $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$ are the source fields for the displacement vector $\boldsymbol{u}$ and the elastic distortion tensor $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, respectively. The important type of pde for dislocations in gradient elasticity is the Helmholtz-Navier equation, which is a pde of 4th-order. Using the technique of Green functions (e.g., [65, 66]), Eqs. (96) and (97) can be easily solved for any given sources $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P},0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$. This can be considered as an eigenstrain problem of dislocations in the framework of gradient elasticity.

3.1 Green tensor of the three-dimensional Helmholtz-Navier equation

The Green tensor of the three-dimensional Helmholtz-Navier equation is defined by

$$LL_{ik}G_{kj} = -\delta_{ij}\delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}') \tag{98}$$

and is given by [24]

$$G_{ij}(R) = \frac{1}{16\pi\mu(1-\nu)} \Big[2(1-\nu)\delta_{ij}\Delta - \partial_i\partial_j \Big] A(R)\,, \tag{99}$$

with the "regularization function"

$$A(R) = R + \frac{2\ell^2}{R} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \right), \tag{100}$$

where $R = |\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}'|$ and ν is the Poisson ratio. In the limit $\ell \to 0$, the three-dimensional Green tensor of classical elasticity [67, 28] is recovered from Eqs. (99) and (100). In contrast to the Green tensor of the Navier equation, which is singular, the Green tensor of the Helmholtz-Navier equation is non-singular (see also [24]). Thus, Eq. (99) represents the regularized Green tensor in the gradient elasticity theory of Helmholtz type. It is noted that $A(R)$ can be written as the convolution of R and $G(R)$

$$A(R) = R * G(R)\,, \tag{101}$$

where G is here the Green function of the three-dimensional Helmholtz equation

$$LG = \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\,, \tag{102}$$

which is given by

$$G(R) = \frac{1}{4\pi\ell^2 R}\, \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\,. \tag{103}$$

The Green function (103) is a Dirac-delta sequence with parametric dependence ℓ

$$\lim_{\ell\to 0} G(R) = \delta(\boldsymbol{R}) \tag{104}$$

and it plays the role of the "regularization Green function" in gradient elasticity. In fact, $G(R)$ gives an isotropic regularization in the theory of isotropic gradient elasticity.

In addition, it holds

$$\Delta\Delta\, R = -8\pi\, \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\,. \tag{105}$$

The "regularization function" (100) fulfills the relations

$$L\Delta\Delta A(R) = -8\pi\, \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}')\,, \tag{106}$$

$$\Delta\Delta A(R) = -8\pi\, G(R)\,, \tag{107}$$

$$LA(R) = R\,. \tag{108}$$

Thus, $A(R)$ is the Green function of Eq. (106) which is a three-dimensional Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation (pde of 6th-order).

In addition, the Green tensor (99) satisfies the following relation

$$\begin{aligned} LG_{ij}(R) &= \frac{1}{16\pi\mu(1-\nu)} \Big[2(1-\nu)\delta_{ij}\Delta - \partial_i\partial_j \Big] LA(R) \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi\mu(1-\nu)} \Big[2(1-\nu)\delta_{ij}\Delta - \partial_i\partial_j \Big] R \\ &= G^0_{ij}(R)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

where G^0_{ij} is the Green tensor of the "classical" Navier equation, $L_{ik}G^0_{kj} = -\delta_{ij}\delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}')$. Eq. (109) is an inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation. A consequence of Eq. (109) is that the Green tensor of the Helmholtz-Navier equation may be written as the convolution of the Green function of the Helmholtz equation with the "classical" Green tensor of the Navier equation

$$G_{ij} = G * G^0_{ij}\,. \tag{110}$$

Therefore, the Green tensor, G_{ij}, fulfills the following inhomogeneous pdes

$$L_{ik}G_{kj} = L_{ik}(G * G^0_{kj}) = G * (L_{ik}G^0_{kj}) = -\delta_{ij}\,G\,, \tag{111}$$

$$LG_{ij} = L(G * G^0_{ij}) = G^0_{ij} * (LG) = G^0_{ij}\,. \tag{112}$$

Eq. (111) is an inhomogeneous Navier equation and Eq. (112) is an inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation for the Green tensor of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. In addition, using the convolution representation (110) and Eq. (111), it can be easily seen that Eq. (98) is satisfied

$$LL_{ik}G_{kj} = LL_{ik}(G * G^0_{kj}) = (LG) * (L_{ik}G^0_{kj}) = -\delta_{ij}\,LG = -\delta_{ij}\delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}')\,. \tag{113}$$

3.2 "Ru-Aifantis theorem" for dislocations and the Bifield-Ansatz

Originally, the so-called "Ru-Aifantis theorem" [60] was derived for compatible gradient elasticity. The "Ru-Aifantis theorem" may be used for problems concerning bodies of infinite extent. In fact, the so-called "Ru-Aifantis theorem" is a special case of a more general technique; well-known in the theory of partial differential equations (see, e.g., [68]). Such an approach is mainly based on the decomposition of a pde of higher-order into a system of pdes of lower-order and on the property that the appearing differential operator(s) can be written as a product of differential operators of lower-order (operator-split). Also, the property that the differential operators commute is often used in the operator-split. Here, we give the generalization of such a technique towards the (incompatible) theory of dislocations in gradient elasticity. The difficulty in the theory of dislocations in the framework of gradient elasticity is that both fields, the field on the left hand side and the source field on the right hand side of the Helmholtz-Navier equations (87) and (89) are "a priori" unknown. Therefore, the "Ru-Aifantis theorem" valid for one single field has to be generalized towards two fields. For that reason the number of equations of the system is changed from two to three. However, it is possible to obtain also equivalent versions of a system with only two equations. We give here both equivalent versions. It is noted that all the equations derived in this subsection are valid for isotropic as well as anisotropic gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type.

The inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Navier equation (87) for the displacement field with the plastic distortion tensor as source (pde of 4th-order)

$$LL_{ik}u_k = C_{ijkl}\partial_j L\beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{kl} \tag{114}$$

can be decomposed into the following system of partial differential equations; namely into an inhomogeneous Navier equation (pde of 2nd-order)

$$L_{ik}u^0_k = C_{ijkl}\partial_j \beta^{\mathrm{P},0}_{kl} \tag{115}$$

and into two uncoupled inhomogeneous Helmholtz equations (pdes of 2nd-order)

$$Lu_i = u_i^0 \,, \tag{116}$$
$$L\beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P}} = \beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P},0} \,. \tag{117}$$

Eq. (115) is the classical Navier equation known from dislocation theory, which serves the source fields for Eqs. (116) and (117). If we substitute Eq. (116) into Eq. (115), we recover the Helmholtz-Navier equation (96). Substituting Eqs. (116) and (117) into Eq. (115), Eq. (114) is recovered.

In addition, Eq. (114) may be rewritten equivalently into the following system of pdes

$$LL_{ik}u_k = C_{ijkl}\partial_j \beta_{kl}^{\mathrm{P},0} \,, \tag{118}$$
$$L\beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P}} = \beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P},0} \,, \tag{119}$$

or into the system of pdes

$$L_{ik}u_k^0 = C_{ijkl}\partial_j L\beta_{kl}^{\mathrm{P}} \,, \tag{120}$$
$$Lu_i = u_i^0 \,. \tag{121}$$

On the other hand, the inhomogeneous Helmholtz-Navier equation (89) for the elastic distortion tensor with the dislocation density tensor as source (pde of 4th-order)

$$LL_{ik}\beta_{km} = -C_{ijkl}\epsilon_{mlr}\partial_j L\alpha_{kr} \,, \tag{122}$$

can be decomposed into the following system of partial differential equations; namely into an inhomogeneous Navier equation (pde of 2nd-order)

$$L_{ik}\beta_{km}^0 = -C_{ijkl}\epsilon_{mlr}\partial_j \alpha_{kr}^0 \,, \tag{123}$$

and into two inhomogeneous Helmholtz equations (pdes of 2nd-order)

$$L\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ij}^0 \,, \tag{124}$$
$$L\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ij}^0 \,. \tag{125}$$

Eq. (123) is a classical Navier equation known from dislocation theory, which serves the source fields for Eqs. (124) and (125). If we substitute Eq. (124) into Eq. (123), we recover the Helmholtz-Navier equation (97).

In addition, Eq. (122) can be rewritten equivalently into the following system of pdes

$$LL_{ik}\beta_{km} = -C_{ijkl}\epsilon_{mlr}\partial_j \alpha_{kr}^0 \,, \tag{126}$$
$$L\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ij}^0 \,, \tag{127}$$

or into the system of pdes

$$L_{ik}\beta_{km}^0 = -C_{ijkl}\epsilon_{mlr}\partial_j L\alpha_{kr} \,, \tag{128}$$
$$L\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ij}^0 \,. \tag{129}$$

Using the Ru-Aifantis approach for the stress tensor, the equilibrium condition (pde of 3rd-order)

$$L\partial_j\sigma_{ij} = 0 \tag{130}$$

is decomposed into the following system of two equations (pdes of 1st-order and 2nd-order)

$$\partial_j\sigma^0_{ij} = 0\,, \tag{131}$$
$$L\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^0_{ij}\,. \tag{132}$$

In (linear) gradient elasticity, the "Bifield" ansatz, as it has been described in subsection (2.1) for the theory of gradient magnetostatics, reads for the stress tensor

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^0_{ij} + \sigma^1_{ij}\,. \tag{133}$$

Substituting Eq. (133) into the Helmholtz equation (132), the following Helmholtz equation for the gradient part of the stress tensor σ^1_{ij} is obtained

$$L\sigma^1_{ij} = \ell^2\Delta\sigma^0_{ij}\,, \tag{134}$$

where the Laplacian of the classical stress tensor σ^0_{ij} is the inhomogeneous part. Moreover, the following Poisson equation for σ_{ij} can be obtained by inserting Eq. (133) into the Helmholtz equation (132)

$$\ell^2\Delta\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^1_{ij}\,. \tag{135}$$

Thus, σ^1_{ij} is a kind of relative stress tensor which is equilibrated by the double stress tensor (80) (see also [61, 62])

$$\sigma^1_{ij} = \partial_k\tau_{ijk}\,. \tag{136}$$

The "Bifield" ansatz of the Cauchy stress tensor (133) induces a "Bifield decomposition for the double stress tensor (80)

$$\tau_{ijk} = \tau^0_{ijk} + \tau^1_{ijk} \tag{137}$$

with (see also [69])

$$\tau^0_{ijk} = \ell^2\partial_k\sigma^0_{ij}\,, \tag{138}$$
$$\tau^1_{ijk} = \ell^2\partial_k\sigma^1_{ij}\,. \tag{139}$$

The Ru-Aifantis approach for the elastic distortion tensor decomposes the equilibrium condition (pde of 3rd-order)

$$C_{ijkl}L\partial_j\beta_{kl} = 0 \tag{140}$$

into the following system of two equations (pdes of 1st-order and 2nd-order)

$$C_{ijkl}\partial_j\beta^0_{kl} = 0\,, \tag{141}$$
$$L\beta_{ij} = \beta^0_{ij}\,. \tag{142}$$

The "Bifield" ansatz for the elastic distortion tensor is given by

$$\beta_{ij} = \beta^0_{ij} + \beta^1_{ij} \,. \tag{143}$$

The substitution of Eq. (143) into the Helmholtz equation (142) gives the following Helmholtz equation for the gradient part of the elastic distortion tensor β^1_{ij}

$$L\beta^1_{ij} = \ell^2 \Delta \beta^0_{ij} \,, \tag{144}$$

where the Laplacian of the classical elastic distortion tensor β^0_{ij} is the source term[4]. In addition, if we substitute Eq. (143) into the Helmholtz equation (142), the following Poisson equation for β_{ij} may be obtained

$$\ell^2 \Delta \beta_{ij} = \beta^1_{ij} \,. \tag{145}$$

If we use a "Bifield" ansatz for the displacement vector

$$u_i = u^0_i + u^1_i \,, \tag{146}$$

the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation (116) gives the following Helmholtz equation for the gradient part of the displacement vector u^1_i

$$Lu^1_i = \ell^2 \Delta u^0_i \,, \tag{147}$$

and the following Poisson equation for u_i

$$\ell^2 \Delta u_i = u^1_i \,. \tag{148}$$

For the "regularization function" (100) the "Bifield" ansatz is

$$A = A^0 + A^1 \,, \tag{149}$$

where

$$A^0 = R \,, \qquad A^1 = \frac{2\ell^2}{R} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \right) . \tag{150}$$

In addition, the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation (108) gives the following Helmholtz equation for the gradient part A^1

$$LA^1 = \ell^2 \Delta A^0 \,, \tag{151}$$

and the following Helmholtz-Laplace equation for the gradient part A^1

$$L\Delta A^1 = -8\pi\ell^2 \, \delta(\boldsymbol{R}) \,, \tag{152}$$

[4]Aifantis [70, 71] claimed that the gradient part, e^1_{ij}, of the elastic strain tensor of dislocations is determined from a homogeneous Helmholtz equation. This is obviously mistaken, since e^1_{ij} satisfies the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation: $Le^1_{ij} = \ell^2 \Delta e^0_{ij}$, where e^0_{ij} is the classical elastic strain tensor.

which shows that A^1 is the Green function of the Helmholtz-Laplace operator. Moreover, A satisfies the following Poisson equation

$$\ell^2 \Delta A = A^1 \,. \tag{153}$$

Thus, using the "Bifield" ansatz, it can be seen that β_{ij}^0, σ_{ij}^0, u_i^0 and A^0 are the classical fields and β_{ij}^1, σ_{ij}^1 , u_i^1 and A^1 are the gradient parts depending on the gradient parameter ℓ.

An important consequence of this procedure is that the tensor σ_{ij}^0 is identified with the classical stress tensor and that the tensor σ_{ij}^1, which is the gradient part of the stress, corresponds to the relative stress tensor. If the classical fields are known, the gradient parts are the only unknown fields in gradient theory. Moreover, the gradient parts are given by inhomogeneous Helmholtz equations. The classical fields only satisfy the field equations of classical elasticity. No Helmholtz equation where a Helmholtz operator L acting on the classical fields is part of the theory of gradient elasticity[5]. In general, both the classical fields and the gradient parts can be singular, only the superposition of the classical and the gradient parts gives non-singular fields due to a "physical" regularization. The physical interpretation of the fields in gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type is in agreement with the physical interpretation of the fields in the Bopp-Bodolsky theory.

3.3 Dislocation loops

In this subsection, we consider a dislocation loop in an unbounded body in the framework of gradient elasticity theory of Helmholtz type. All the dislocation key-formulas are derived for gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. For a general dislocation loop C, the classical dislocation density and the plastic distortion tensors read (e.g., [73, 74])

$$\alpha_{ij}^0 = b_i \, \delta_j(C) = b_i \oint_C \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}') \, dl'_j \,, \tag{154}$$

$$\beta_{ij}^{\mathrm{P},0} = -b_i \, \delta_j(S) = -b_i \int_S \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}') \, dS'_j \,, \tag{155}$$

where b_i is the Burgers vector, dl'_j denotes the dislocation line element at $\boldsymbol{x}'$ and dS'_j is the corresponding dislocation loop area. The surface S is the dislocation surface, which is a "cap" of the dislocation line C. The surface S represents the area swept by the loop C during its motion. The plastic distortion (155) caused by a dislocation loop is concentrated at the dislocation surface S. Thus, the surface S is what determines the history of the plastic distortion of a dislocation loop. $\delta_j(C)$ is the Dirac delta function for a closed curve C and $\delta_j(S)$ is the Dirac delta function for a surface S with boundary C.

The solution of Eq. (95) is the following convolution integral

$$\alpha_{ij} = G * \alpha_{ij}^0 = b_i \oint_C G(R) \, dl'_j \,, \tag{156}$$

[5] Using an erroneous terminology in gradient elasticity, Polyzos et al. [50], Karlis et al. [52], Aravas and Giannakopoulos [72] and Aifantis [53] derived an inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation for the classical Cauchy stress tensor: $L\sigma_{ij}^0 = \sigma_{ij}$, which is based on a physical misinterpretation of the Cauchy stress tensor in gradient elasticity.

where $G(R)$ denotes the three-dimensional Green function of the Helmholtz equation given by Eq. (103). The explicit solution of the dislocation density tensor for a dislocation loop reads

$$\alpha_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{b_i}{4\pi\ell^2} \oint_C \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}}{R}\, dl'_j\,, \tag{157}$$

describing a dislocation core spreading. If we compare Eqs. (154) and (157) with Eqs. (56) and (63), respectively, it can be seen that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$ plays the role of the "true" dislocation density tensor and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ has the physical meaning of an "effective" dislocation density tensor.

The plastic distortion tensor of a dislocation loop, which is the solution of Eq. (94), is given by the convolution integral

$$\beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{ij} = G * \beta^{\mathrm{P},0}_{ij} = -b_i \int_S G(R)\, dS'_j\,. \tag{158}$$

Explicitly, it reads

$$\beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{b_i}{4\pi\ell^2} \int_S \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}}{R}\, dS'_j\,. \tag{159}$$

It is important to note that the gradient solution of the plastic distortion is not concentrated at the dislocation surface S, but it is distributed around S according to Eq. (159). The field $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P}}$ may be also called the "effective" plastic distortion. Substituting Eq. (159) in Eq. (77) and using the Stokes theorem, formula (157) is recovered. Due to the convolution of the classical dislocation density, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0$, and the classical plastic distortion, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P},0}$, with the Green function, G, the effective dislocation density, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and the effective plastic distortion, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{P}}$, are smeared out and modeling, in such a manner, a dislocation core region in gradient elasticity. In this way, the dislocation core spreading function, G, is of Yukawa type. For small distances, $R \ll \ell$, G varies as $1/R$ and for larger distances, however, G decreases exponentially. Therefore, the dislocation core spreading function has a finite range.

3.3.1 Burgers, Mura and Peach-Koehler stress formulas

After a straightforward calculation all the generalizations of the dislocation key-formulas (Mura, Peach-Koehler, and Burgers formulas) towards gradient elasticity can be obtained. Starting with the elastic distortion tensor of a dislocation loop, the solution of Eq. (97) gives the representation as the following convolution integral

$$\beta_{im} = \epsilon_{mnr} C_{jkln} \partial_k G_{ij} * \alpha^0_{lr}\,. \tag{160}$$

Eq. (160) is the gradient version of "Mura's half" of the so-called Mura-Willis formula [75, 76] due to the appearance of the Green tensor of the Helmholtz-Navier equation (99). Like in classical dislocation theory, the trace of the dislocation density tensor α^0_{pp} gives zero contribution to the elastic distortion tensor, if we substitute $\alpha^0_{lr} = \delta_{lr}\, \alpha^0_{pp}$ into Eq. (160). Using the differentiation rule of the convolution [41, 42] and Eqs. (95) and (109), we find the identity

$$\beta_{im} = \epsilon_{mnr} C_{jkln} \partial_k G_{ij} * L\alpha_{lr} = \epsilon_{mnr} C_{jkln} \partial_k L G_{ij} * \alpha_{lr} = \epsilon_{mnr} C_{jkln} \partial_k G^0_{ij} * \alpha_{lr}\,, \tag{161}$$

where $\beta^0_{im} = \epsilon_{mnr} C_{jkln} \partial_k G^0_{ij} * \alpha^0_{lr}$. This shows again the relation between the four pdes (122), (123), (126), and (128). Using Eq. (156), it can be represented as a double convolution

$$\beta_{im} = \epsilon_{mnr} C_{jkln} \partial_k G^0_{ij} * G * \alpha^0_{lr} = \beta^0_{im} * G \,. \tag{162}$$

Finally, using the relation (110), Eq. (160) is recovered from Eq. (162). Due to the Green function G, Eq. (162) is the regularization of the "classical" Mura equation. If we substitute Eqs. (73) and (99) into Eq. (160), rearrange terms, use partial integration and $\partial_j \alpha^0_{ij} = 0$, we find for the elastic distortion tensor caused by the prescribed dislocation distribution α^0_{kr}

$$\beta_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_V \Big[\big(\epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} - \epsilon_{rkl}\delta_{ij} + \epsilon_{rij}\delta_{kl} \big) \partial_l \Delta + \frac{1}{1-\nu}\, \epsilon_{rkl} \partial_l \partial_i \partial_j \Big] A(R)\, \alpha^0_{kr}(\boldsymbol{x}')\, dV' \,. \tag{163}$$

In the limit $\ell \to 0$, Eq. (163) tends to the classical result given by deWit [77].

Now, substituting the classical dislocation density tensor of a dislocation loop (154) and carrying out the integration of the delta function, we find the modified Mura formula valid in gradient elasticity

$$\beta_{im}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \oint_C \epsilon_{mnr} b_l C_{jkln} \partial_k G_{ij}(R)\, dl'_r \,. \tag{164}$$

Substituting Eqs. (73) and (99) into Eq. (164), rearranging terms and using the Stokes theorem or more directly from Eq. (163), the generalized Mura equation valid in gradient elasticity is obtained

$$\beta_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{b_k}{8\pi} \oint_C \Big[\big(\epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} - \epsilon_{rkl}\delta_{ij} + \epsilon_{rij}\delta_{kl} \big) \partial_l \Delta + \frac{1}{1-\nu}\, \epsilon_{rkl} \partial_l \partial_i \partial_j \Big] A(R)\, dl'_r \,. \tag{165}$$

It is noted that if Eq. (165) is substituted into Eq. (76) and the relation (107) is used, the dislocation density of a dislocation loop (157) is recovered. The symmetric part of the elastic distortion tensor (165) gives the elastic strain tensor of a dislocation loop

$$e_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{b_k}{8\pi} \oint_C \Big[\Big(\frac{1}{2}\, \epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} + \frac{1}{2}\, \epsilon_{ikl}\delta_{jr} - \epsilon_{rkl}\delta_{ij} \Big) \partial_l \Delta + \frac{1}{1-\nu}\, \epsilon_{rkl} \partial_l \partial_i \partial_j \Big] A(R)\, dl'_r \,. \tag{166}$$

Using the constitutive relation (79) and Eq. (162), we obtain the representation of the Cauchy stress σ_{ij} as convolution of the classical singular stress σ^0_{ij} with the Green function G of the Helmholtz equation

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^0_{ij} * G \,, \tag{167}$$

which is the (particular) solution of the inhomogeneous Helmholtz equation (91). This follows by applying the Helmholtz operator (86) to both sides of Eq. (167). The result is (see, e.g., [42])

$$L\sigma_{ij} = L(\sigma^0_{ij} * G) = \sigma^0_{ij} * (LG) = \sigma^0_{ij} * \delta = \sigma^0_{ij} \,. \tag{168}$$

Such solution is unique in the class of generalized functions. If we use Eq. (167), the property of the differentiation of a convolution and that the operation of convolution is commutative [41, 42], we find that the divergence of the Cauchy stress tensor in gradient elasticity is zero

$$\partial_j \sigma_{ij} = \partial_j (G * \sigma^0_{ij}) = G * (\partial_j \sigma^0_{ij}) = 0\,, \tag{169}$$

since $\partial_j \sigma^0_{ij} = 0$. In order to differentiate a convolution, it suffices to differentiate any one of the factors [42]. Therefore, if the convolution (167) exists, then the Cauchy stress tensor of gradient elasticity is self-equilibrated. In addition, it can be seen that Eq. (169) is similar to the Coulomb gauge condition (20). Using the "Bifield" ansatz (133), $\partial_j \sigma^1_{ij} = 0$ follows from Eq. (169).

Substituting Eq. (166) into Eq. (79) and using Eq. (73), the non-singular stress field produced by a dislocation loop is

$$\sigma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{\mu b_k}{8\pi} \oint_C \Big[\big(\epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} + \epsilon_{ikl}\delta_{jr}\big)\partial_l \Delta + \frac{2}{1-\nu}\,\epsilon_{rkl}\big(\partial_i\partial_j - \delta_{ij}\Delta\big)\partial_l \Big] A(R)\, dl'_r\,, \tag{170}$$

which can be interpreted as the Peach-Koehler stress formula within the framework of gradient elasticity. One may verify that the Cauchy stress (170) is divergence-less, $\partial_j \sigma_{ij} = 0$, and thus it is self-equilibrated. The double stress tensor of a dislocation loop is easily obtained if Eq. (170) is substituted into Eq. (80). If we substitute Eqs. (A.5) and (A.6) into Eq. (170), we obtain the explicit expression for the Peach-Koehler stress formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{\mu b_l}{8\pi} \oint_C \Bigg[& \Big(\epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} + \epsilon_{ikl}\delta_{jr} - \frac{2}{1-\nu}\,\epsilon_{rkl}\delta_{ij}\Big)\frac{2R_k}{R^3}\Big[1 - \Big(1 + \frac{R}{\ell}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big] \\
& + \frac{2}{1-\nu}\,\epsilon_{rkl}\Bigg(\frac{\delta_{ij}\,R_k + \delta_{ik}\,R_j + \delta_{jk}\,R_i}{R^3}\Big[1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big) + \Big(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big] \\
& - \frac{3R_iR_jR_k}{R^5}\Big[1 - \frac{10\ell^2}{R^2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big) + \Big(4 + \frac{10\ell}{R} + \frac{2R}{3\ell}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big]\Bigg)\Bigg] dl'_r\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{171}$$

It can be seen that the Peach-Koehler stress formula (171) is similar to, but more complicated than, the Biot-Savart law (60).

The solution of Eq. (96) is the following convolution integral

$$u_i = -C_{jkln}\partial_k G_{ij} * \beta^{\mathrm{P},0}_{ln}. \tag{172}$$

Using the differentiation rule of a convolution [41] and Eqs. (92) and (109), we find the identity

$$u_i = -C_{jkln}\partial_k G_{ij} * L\beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{ln} = -C_{jkln}\partial_k L G_{ij} * \beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{ln} = -C_{jkln}\partial_k G^0_{ij} * \beta^{\mathrm{P}}_{ln}\,. \tag{173}$$

This reflects again the relation between the four pdes (114), (115), (118), and (120). Using Eq. (158), it can be represented as a double convolution

$$u_i = -C_{jkln}\partial_k G^0_{ij} * G * \beta^{\mathrm{P},0}_{ln} = u^0_i * G\,, \tag{174}$$

where $u_i^0 = -C_{jkln}\partial_k G_{ij}^0 * \beta_{ln}^{\mathrm{P},0}$. Finally, using the relation (110), Eq. (172) is recovered from Eq. (174). Due to the Green function G, Eq. (174) is the regularization of the "classical" Burgers equation. If we substitute Eqs. (73) and (99) into Eq. (172) and rearrange terms, we find the displacement field in terms of the plastic distortion $\beta_{ln}^{\mathrm{P},0}$

$$u_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{1}{8\pi}\int_V \Big[\big(\delta_{il}\partial_n + \delta_{in}\partial_l - \delta_{ln}\partial_i\big)\Delta + \frac{1}{1-\nu}\big(\delta_{ln}\Delta - \partial_l\partial_n\big)\partial_i\Big] A(R)\,\beta_{ln}^{\mathrm{P},0}(\boldsymbol{x}')\,dV' \,. \tag{175}$$

In the limit $\ell \to 0$, Eq. (175) tends to the classical result given by deWit [77].

Substitution of the classical plastic distortion of a dislocation loop (155) into Eq. (172) gives the modified Volterra formula valid in gradient elasticity

$$u_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int_S b_l C_{jkln}\partial_k G_{ij}(R)\,dS_n' \,. \tag{176}$$

On the other hand, substituting Eqs. (73) and (99) into Eq. (176), rearranging terms and using the Stokes theorem, the key-formula for the non-singular displacement vector in gradient elasticity is obtained

$$u_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{b_i}{4\pi}\,\Omega(\boldsymbol{x}) + \frac{b_l\epsilon_{klj}}{8\pi}\oint_C \left\{\delta_{ij}\Delta - \frac{1}{1-\nu}\,\partial_i\partial_j\right\} A(R)\,dl_k' \,, \tag{177}$$

where the solid angle valid in gradient elasticity is defined by

$$\Omega(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_S \Delta\partial_j A(R)\,dS_j' = \int_S \frac{R_j}{R^3}\Big(1 - \Big(1 + \frac{R}{\ell}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big)\,dS_j' \,. \tag{178}$$

Eq. (177) is the Burgers formula valid in the framework of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. Eq. (178) is non-singular and depends on the length scale ℓ. The solid angle (178) valid in gradient elasticity can also be transformed into a line integral [78]. Carrying out the differentiations in Eq. (177) by the help of Eqs. (A.3) and (A.4), we obtain the explicit gradient elasticity version of the Burgers formula

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = &-\frac{b_i}{4\pi}\,\Omega(\boldsymbol{x}) - \frac{b_l}{4\pi}\oint_C \epsilon_{ilk}\,\frac{1}{R}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) dl_k' \\ &- \frac{b_l}{8\pi(1-\nu)}\oint_C \epsilon_{ljk}\Big[\frac{\delta_{ij}}{R}\Big(1 - \frac{2\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \frac{2\ell}{R}\,\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big) \\ &\qquad - \frac{R_i R_j}{R^3}\Big(1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \Big(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R}\Big)\,\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big)\Big]\,dl_k' \,. \end{aligned} \tag{179}$$

3.3.2 Peach-Koehler force between two dislocation loops

Now, we analyze the Peach-Koehler force in gradient elasticity. Using the Eshelby stress tensor of gradient elasticity (e.g., [79])

$$P_{kj} = W\delta_{jk} - \big(\sigma_{ij} - \partial_l\tau_{ijl}\big)\beta_{ik} - \tau_{ilj}\partial_l\beta_{ik} \,, \tag{180}$$

the corresponding Peach-Koehler force is obtained

$$\int_V \partial_j P_{kj}\, dV = F_k^{\mathrm{PK}}\,. \tag{181}$$

The Peach-Koehler force, valid in gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type, was originally calculated by Lazar and Kirchner [79]

$$\begin{aligned} F_k^{\mathrm{PK}} &= \int_V \epsilon_{kjl}\big\{\sigma_{ij}\alpha_{il} + \tau_{ijm}\,\partial_m\alpha_{il}\big\}\, dV \\ &= \int_V \epsilon_{kjl}\big\{\sigma_{ij}\alpha_{il} + \ell^2(\partial_m\sigma_{ij})(\partial_m\alpha_{il})\big\}\, dV \\ &= \int_V \epsilon_{kjl}\big\{\sigma_{ij}L\alpha_{il} + \ell^2\partial_m(\sigma_{ij}\partial_m\alpha_{il})\big\}\, dV \\ &= \int_V \epsilon_{kjl}\sigma_{ij}\alpha_{il}^0\, dV\,. \end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

From the third to the fourth line, we used Eq. (95) and neglected the div-term (surface term) at infinity.

If we substitute Eq. (154) into Eq. (182), we find for the Peach-Koehler force

$$F_k^{\mathrm{PK}} = \oint_C \epsilon_{kjm} b_i \sigma_{ij}\, dl'_m\,, \tag{183}$$

which is the force produced by an "external" stress acting on a dislocation loop C. Moreover, substituting Eqs. (154) and (170) into Eq. (182) and then integration in V, we obtain the Peach-Koehler force between the dislocation loop $C^{(A)}$ in the stress field of the dislocation loop $C^{(B)}$:

$$F_m^{\mathrm{PK}} = \frac{\mu\, b_i^{(A)} b_k^{(B)}}{8\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \epsilon_{mnj}\Big[\big(\epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} + \epsilon_{ikl}\delta_{jr}\big)\partial_l\Delta + \frac{2}{1-\nu}\,\epsilon_{rkl}\big(\partial_i\partial_j - \delta_{ij}\Delta\big)\partial_l\Big] A(R)\, dl_r^{(B)}\, dl_n^{(A)}, \tag{184}$$

where $R = |\boldsymbol{x}^{(A)} - \boldsymbol{x}^{(B)}|$ and using Eq. (171), we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_m^{\mathrm{PK}} = \frac{\mu\, b_i^{(A)} b_l^{(B)}}{8\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \epsilon_{mnj}\Bigg[&\Big(\epsilon_{jkl}\delta_{ir} + \epsilon_{ikl}\delta_{jr} - \frac{2}{1-\nu}\,\epsilon_{rkl}\delta_{ij}\Big)\frac{2R_k}{R^3}\Big[1 - \Big(1 + \frac{R}{\ell}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big] \\ &+ \frac{2}{1-\nu}\,\epsilon_{rkl}\Bigg(\frac{\delta_{ij}\,R_k + \delta_{ik}\,R_j + \delta_{jk}\,R_i}{R^3}\Big[1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big) + \Big(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big] \\ &- \frac{3R_iR_jR_k}{R^5}\Big[1 - \frac{10\ell^2}{R^2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big) + \Big(4 + \frac{10\ell}{R} + \frac{2R}{3\ell}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big]\Bigg)\Bigg]\, dl_r^{(B)}\, dl_n^{(A)}, \end{aligned} \tag{185}$$

which is non-singular. The self-force of a dislocation loop can be found from the Peach-Koehler force formula (185) by using the same curve for $C^{(A)}$ and $C^{(B)}$ and the same Burgers vectors $b_i^{(A)}$ and $b_l^{(A)}$.

3.3.3 Stress functions and the elastic interaction energy between two dislocation loops

Since the stress tensor σ_{ij} is symmetric and has zero divergence for equilibrium in absence of body forces, it can be expressed as the inc of a second-order stress function tensor B_{ij} as (e.g., [80, 81])

$$\sigma_{ij} = -\epsilon_{ikl}\epsilon_{jmn}\partial_k\partial_m B_{ln}\,. \tag{186}$$

It can be seen that B_{ij} is a symmetric tensor. Following Kröner [49], it is convenient to introduce another symmetric stress function tensor χ_{ij} which is defined as

$$\chi_{ij} = \frac{1}{2\mu}\left(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} - \frac{\nu}{1+2\nu}\,\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}\right)B_{kl} \tag{187}$$

with the inverse relation

$$B_{ij} = 2\mu\left(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\,\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}\right)\chi_{kl}\,. \tag{188}$$

The stress function tensor χ_{ij} satisfies the following side condition ("Kröner gauge")

$$\partial_j\chi_{ij} = 0 = \partial_i\chi_{ij}\,. \tag{189}$$

The so-called incompatibility tensor η_{ij} which is defined in terms of the elastic strain tensor [49, 82, 81] is given by

$$\eta_{ij} = -\epsilon_{ikl}\epsilon_{jmn}\partial_k\partial_m e_{ln}\,. \tag{190}$$

In terms of the dislocation density tensor α_{ij}, the incompatibility tensor η_{ij} has the form [49, 82, 81]

$$\eta_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\epsilon_{ikl}\partial_k\alpha_{lj} + \epsilon_{jkl}\partial_k\alpha_{li}\right). \tag{191}$$

On the other hand, the stress tensor fulfills the Beltrami-Michell stress incompatibility condition (see, e.g., [49, 81])

$$\Delta\sigma_{ij} + \frac{1}{1+\nu}\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \delta_{ij}\Delta\right)\sigma_{kk} = 2\mu\,\eta_{ij}\,. \tag{192}$$

Multiplying Eq. (192) by the Helmholtz operator L, we obtain

$$L\Big[\Delta\sigma_{ij} + \frac{1}{1+\nu}\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \delta_{ij}\Delta\right)\sigma_{kk}\Big] = 2\mu\,\eta^0_{ij}\,, \tag{193}$$

with

$$\eta^0_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\epsilon_{ikl}\partial_k\alpha^0_{lj} + \epsilon_{jkl}\partial_k\alpha^0_{li}\right), \tag{194}$$

where we used Eq. (95) and

$$L\eta_{ij} = \eta_{ij}^0 \,. \tag{195}$$

Substituting Eq. (188) into Eq. (186), the stress tensor reads in terms of the stress function tensor χ_{ij} as

$$\sigma_{ij} = 2\mu\Big(\Delta\chi_{ij} + \frac{1}{1-\nu}\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \delta_{ij}\Delta\right)\chi_{kk}\Big) \,. \tag{196}$$

If we substitute Eq. (196) into Eq. (193), we obtain

$$L\Delta\Delta\,\chi_{ij} = \eta_{ij}^0 \,, \tag{197}$$

which is an inhomogeneous Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation for χ_{ij}. The Green function of the Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation (pde of 6th-order) is defined as

$$L\Delta\Delta G = \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}') \,. \tag{198}$$

Comparing Eq. (198) with Eq. (106), the Green function can be written in terms of the "regularization function" (100). Thus, the Green function of the Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation is given by

$$G(R) = -\frac{1}{8\pi}\,A(R) = -\frac{1}{8\pi}\left(R + \frac{2\ell^2}{R}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right)\right) . \tag{199}$$

Some remarks on the Green function of the Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation given by Eringen [83, 84] in the framework of nonlocal elasticity of Helmholtz type are following. The Green function given by Eringen [83, 85, 84] is not the correct one since the second term of Eq. (199), $2\ell^2/R$, is missing in Eringen's expression for G (compare with Eq. (6.13.24) in [84]). Therefore, Eringen's expression for G does not give the correct Green function of the Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation (198). As a consequence, the derived Peach-Koehler stress formula based on the mistaken expression for G remains still singular. Moreover, using the correct Green function (199), one can derive the correct Peach-Koehler stress formula in nonlocal elasticity of Helmholtz type, which agrees with the Peach-Koehler stress formula (170) in gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. The Peach-Koehler stress formula (171) based on the Green function (199) is not singular. Thus, the expressions (170) and (171) represent the correct Peach-Koehler stress tensor field in the framework of nonlocal elasticity of Helmholtz type as well. For gradient elasticity of bi-Helmholtz type [86] and nonlocal elasticity of bi-Helmholtz type [87] the regularization function $A(R)$ and the corresponding Green function $G(R)$ of the bi-Helmholtz-bi-Laplace equation can be found in [24].

The solution of Eq. (197) for an infinite solid may be given by

$$\chi_{ij} = G * \eta_{ij}^0 \,. \tag{200}$$

If we substitute Eqs. (194) and (154) and calculate the convolution integral, this gives

$$\chi_{ij} = \frac{b_l}{8\pi}\frac{1}{2}\left(\epsilon_{ikl}\oint_C \partial_k A(R)\,dl'_j + \epsilon_{jkl}\oint_C \partial_k A(R)\,dl'_i\right) , \tag{201}$$

where we have used the Green-Gauss theorem and set a surface term at infinity to zero. The trace term of the stress function tensor reads now

$$\chi_{ii} = \frac{b_l}{8\pi}\,\epsilon_{ikl}\oint_C \partial_k A(R)\,dl'_i\,. \tag{202}$$

Upon substituting Eqs. (201) and (202) into Eq. (196), the Peach-Koehler stress formula (170) is obtained.

Now, we turn to the interaction energy. According to the theory of gradient elasticity, the interaction energy can be written as

$$W^{(AB)} = \int_V \Big(\sigma_{ij}^{(B)} e_{ij}^{(A)} + \ell^2 \partial_k \sigma_{ij}^{(B)} \partial_k e_{ij}^{(A)}\Big)\,dV = \int_V \sigma_{ij}^{(B)}\, L e_{ij}^{(A)}\,dV\,, \tag{203}$$

where we have used again the Green-Gauss theorem and set the surface term at infinity to zero. By partial integration and using Eqs. (196), (191) and (195), Eq. (203) can be transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(AB)} &= -\int_V \big(\epsilon_{ikl}\epsilon_{jmn}\,\partial_k\partial_m B_{ln}^{(B)}\big)\, L e_{ij}^{(A)}\,dV \\ &= -\int_V B_{ln}^{(B)}\,\big(\epsilon_{ikl}\epsilon_{jmn}\,\partial_k\partial_m\, L e_{ij}^{(A)}\big)\,dV \\ &= \int_V B_{ij}^{(B)}\big(L\eta_{ij}^{(A)}\big)\,dV \\ &= \int_V B_{ij}^{(B)}\,\eta_{ij}^{0,(A)}\,dV\,. \end{aligned} \tag{204}$$

Now, substituting Eqs. (188), (194) and (154) into Eq. (204), we obtain after the volume integration

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(AB)} &= 2\mu\int_V \Big(\chi_{ij}^{(B)} + \frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\,\delta_{ij}\chi_{kk}^{(B)}\Big)\eta_{ij}^{0,(A)}\,dV \\ &= 2\mu\,\epsilon_{ikl}\,b_l^{(A)}\oint_{C^{(A)}} \partial_k\Big(\chi_{ij}^{(B)} + \frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\,\delta_{ij}\,\chi_{pp}^{(B)}\Big)dl_j^{(A)}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{205}$$

Eq. (205) represents the energy of a dislocation line "running" along the curve $C^{(A)}$ with Burgers vector $b_l^{(A)}$ interacting with a field whose stress function is given by $\chi_{ij}^{(B)}$. If we substitute Eqs. (201) and (202) into Eq. (205), we find the mutual interaction energy between two closed dislocation loops

$$W^{(AB)} = \frac{\mu}{8\pi}\,b_i^{(A)}b_j^{(B)}\oint_{C^{(A)}}\oint_{C^{(B)}} \epsilon_{ikl}\epsilon_{jmn}\,\partial_k\partial_m\,A(R)\Big(dl_l^{(B)}\,dl_n^{(A)} + \delta_{ln}\,dl_p^{(B)}\,dl_p^{(A)} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\,dl_n^{(B)}\,dl_l^{(A)}\Big)\,. \tag{206}$$

In the limit $\ell \to 0$, the form of the interaction energy given by Kröner [49, 82] (see also [40, 80, 88]) is obtained. Eq. (206) may be re-written as

$$W^{(AB)} = b_i^{(A)}b_j^{(B)}M_{ij}^{(AB)} \tag{207}$$

with the so-called "dislocation mutual inductance" tensor, which is in general asymmetric,

$$M_{ij}^{(AB)} = \frac{\mu}{8\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \epsilon_{ikl}\epsilon_{jmn}\, \partial_k \partial_m\, A(R) \Big(dl_l^{(B)}\, dl_n^{(A)} + \delta_{ln}\, dl_p^{(B)}\, dl_p^{(A)} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\, dl_n^{(B)}\, dl_l^{(A)} \Big) . \tag{208}$$

On the other hand, Eq. (206) can be simplified to

$$W^{(AB)} = -\frac{\mu}{8\pi}\, b_i^{(A)} b_j^{(B)} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \Big[\Delta\, A(R) \Big(dl_j^{(B)}\, dl_i^{(A)} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\, dl_i^{(B)}\, dl_j^{(A)} \Big) + \frac{2}{1-\nu} \left(\partial_i \partial_j - \delta_{ij}\, \Delta \right) A(R)\, dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \Big] \tag{209}$$

and the corresponding "dislocation mutual inductance" tensor is given by

$$M_{ij}^{(AB)} = -\frac{\mu}{8\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \Big[\Delta\, A(R) \Big(dl_j^{(B)}\, dl_i^{(A)} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\, dl_i^{(B)}\, dl_j^{(A)} \Big) + \frac{2}{1-\nu} \left(\partial_i \partial_j - \delta_{ij}\, \Delta \right) A(R)\, dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \Big] . \tag{210}$$

In the limit $\ell \to 0$, the form of the interaction energy given by deWit [40, 89] is recovered. By use of the Eqs. (A.3) and (A.4), Eq. (209) reads explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(AB)} = -\frac{\mu}{8\pi}\, b_i^{(A)} b_j^{(B)} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \Bigg[& \frac{2}{R} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) \Big(dl_j^{(B)}\, dl_i^{(A)} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\, dl_i^{(B)}\, dl_j^{(A)} \Big) \\ & + \frac{2}{1-\nu} \Bigg(\frac{\delta_{ij}}{R} \Big[1 - \frac{2\ell^2}{R^2} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) + \frac{2\ell}{R}\, \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big] - \frac{2\delta_{ij}}{R} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) \\ & - \frac{R_i R_j}{R^3} \Big[1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) + \Big(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R} \Big) \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big] \Bigg)\, dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \Bigg] , \end{aligned} \tag{211}$$

where it can be easily seen that the interaction energy is non-singular. The corresponding "dislocation mutual inductance" tensor is

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij}^{(AB)} = -\frac{\mu}{8\pi} \oint_{C^{(A)}} \oint_{C^{(B)}} \Bigg[& \frac{2}{R} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) \Big(dl_j^{(B)}\, dl_i^{(A)} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\, dl_i^{(B)}\, dl_j^{(A)} \Big) \\ & + \frac{2}{1-\nu} \Bigg(\frac{\delta_{ij}}{R} \Big[1 - \frac{2\ell^2}{R^2} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) + \frac{2\ell}{R}\, \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big] - \frac{2\delta_{ij}}{R} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) \\ & - \frac{R_i R_j}{R^3} \Big[1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2} \Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big) + \Big(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R} \Big) \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell} \Big] \Bigg)\, dl_k^{(B)}\, dl_k^{(A)} \Bigg] . \end{aligned} \tag{212}$$

The self-energy of a dislocation loop can be found by using the same curve for $C^{(A)}$ and $C^{(B)}$, so that $M_{ij}^{(AA)}$ becomes the tensor of "dislocation self-inductance". Inserting a factor $\frac{1}{2}$, we find: $W^{(AA)} = \frac{1}{2}\, b_i^{(A)} b_j^{(A)} M_{ij}^{(AA)}$.

Thus, in subsection 3.3 we have seen that the Burgers, Mura, Peach-Koehler stress, Peach-Koehler force and the mutual interaction energy formulas are non-singular in the framework of gradient elasticity theory of Helmholtz type. Finally, one can observe that all these dislocation key-formulas can be obtained from their classical counterparts by means

of the substitution: $R \to A(R)$. On the other hand, substituting the decomposition of the "regularization function" (149) into the dislocation key-formulas, the classical term and the gradient term of the dislocation key-formulas are easily obtained corresponding to the classical term A^0 and the gradient term A^1. Gradient elasticity is a theory with dislocation core regularization. This is not only necessary for the explanation of physical core effects, but also for the elimination of singularities in a physically well founded manner in numerical simulations. In the limit $\ell \to 0$, the classical singular dislocation key-formulas are obtained from the non-singular ones (see, e.g., [90, 80, 81, 28]). These results may be used in computer simulations of discrete dislocation dynamics and in the numerics as fast numerical sums of the relevant elastic fields as they are used for the classical equations (e.g., [29, 91]). One of the main limitations of current dislocation dynamics models is the inability to resolve dislocation interactions in close range without ad-hoc or more sophisticated regularization strategies. The regularization offered here by the gradient theory is particularly advantageous for dislocation dynamics simulations. The 3D non-singular dislocation fields can be implemented in 3D dislocation dynamics codes [92]. This can represent the breakthrough of gradient elasticity in the modeling of dislocation dynamics without singularities. Such a dislocation dynamics without singularities offers the promise of predicting the dislocation microstructure evolution from fundamental principles and based on sound physical grounds. Therefore, a dislocation-based plasticity theory can be based on gradient elasticity theory of non-singular dislocations.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, the gradient theory of magnetostatics has been presented as part of the Bopp-Podolsky theory in order to show how gradient theories are used in physics. We have investigated an electric current loop and the Biot-Savart law. Using the theory of gradient magnetostatics, we found non-singular solutions for all relevant fields in analogy to the "classical" singular solutions of magnetostatics. Also, the so-called "Bifield" ansatz has been discussed in this framework.

In the main part of the paper, the theory of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type has been presented and investigated. Many analogies and similarities between gradient magnetostatics and gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type have been pointed out. Furthermore, non-singular dislocation key-formulas have been presented in the framework of gradient elasticity. The technique of Green functions has been used. A "Bifield" ansatz has been used and the "Ru-Aifantis theorem" has been generalized to the problem of dislocations in gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. From the field theoretical point of view, the theory of gradient elasticity is similar to, but more complicated than, the theory of gradient magnetostatics. The elastic distortion, plastic distortion, stress, displacement, and dislocation density of a closed dislocation loop were calculated using the theory of gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. Such a generalized continuum theory allows dislocation core spreading in a straightforward way. In the theory of gradient elasticity all formulas are closed and self-consistent. It should be emphasized that the Green function, G, of the Helmholtz equation plays the role of the regularization function in gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type. In addition, we have found two important basic-results for the theory of gradient

elasticity of Helmholtz type. First, we have shown that the tensor, $\sigma^0_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} - \partial_k \tau_{ijk}$, is identical with the classical stress tensor and, therefore, there is no need to call such a tensor as total stress tensor. Second, using the theory of generalized functions, we have shown that the Cauchy stress tensor of gradient elasticity σ_{ij} is self-equilibrated, $\partial_j \sigma_{ij} = 0$.

The obtained dislocation key-formulas can be used in computer simulations and numerics of discrete dislocation dynamics of arbitrary 3D dislocation configurations. They can be implemented in dislocation dynamics codes (finite element implementation, technique of fast numerical sums, method of parametric dislocation dynamics), and compared to atomistic models (e.g., [29, 28]). Thus, the obtained non-singular dislocation key-formulas serve the basis of a non-singular discrete dislocation dynamics.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges Dr. Eleni Agiasofitou for many fruitful discussions and constructive remarks, which significantly influenced this work. The author acknowledges the grants from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Grant Nos. La1974/2-1, La1974/2-2, La1974/3-1).

A Derivatives of the "regularization function" A

In this appendix, the relevant derivatives of the "regularization function" A are given. For gradient elasticity of Helmholtz type, the elementary function A is given by

$$A = R + \frac{2\ell^2}{R}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right). \tag{A.1}$$

The higher-order derivatives of A are given by the following set of equations

$$\partial_i A = \frac{R_i}{R}\Big[1 - \frac{2\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \frac{2\ell}{R}\,\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big], \tag{A.2}$$

where $R_i = x_i - x'_i$,

$$\partial_j\partial_i A = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{R}\Big[1 - \frac{2\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \frac{2\ell}{R}\,\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big] - \frac{R_i R_j}{R^3}\Big[1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \left(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big], \tag{A.3}$$

$$\partial_i\partial_i A = \frac{2}{R}\Big(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big), \tag{A.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_k\partial_j\partial_i A = &- \frac{\delta_{ij}\,R_k + \delta_{ik}\,R_j + \delta_{jk}\,R_i}{R^3}\Big[1 - \frac{6\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \left(2 + \frac{6\ell}{R}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big] \\ &+ \frac{3R_iR_jR_k}{R^5}\Big[1 - \frac{10\ell^2}{R^2}\left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\right) + \left(4 + \frac{10\ell}{R} + \frac{2R}{3\ell}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big]\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

and

$$\partial_k\partial_i\partial_i A = -\frac{2R_k}{R^3}\Big(1-\Big(1+\frac{R}{\ell}\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-R/\ell}\Big)\,. \tag{A.6}$$

The expressions (A.1)–(A.6) are non-singular.

B Boundary conditions in gradient elasticity

The general form of the boundary conditions (BCs) corresponding to Eq. (85) in gradient elasticity reads (see, e.g., [15, 17, 93])

$$\left.\begin{aligned}\big(\sigma_{ij}-\partial_k\tau_{ijk}\big)n_j-\partial_j\big(\tau_{ijk}n_k\big)+n_j\partial_l\big(\tau_{ijk}n_kn_l\big)&=\bar{t}_i\\ \tau_{ijk}n_jn_k&=\bar{q}_i\end{aligned}\right\}\qquad\text{on}\qquad\partial\Omega\,, \tag{B.1}$$

where t_i and q_i are the Cauchy traction vector and the double stress traction vector, respectively. Moreover, $\partial\Omega$ is the smooth boundary surface of the domain Ω occupied by the body satisfying the Euler-Lagrange equation (85), n_i denotes the unit outward-directed vector normal to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, and the overhead bar represents the prescribed value. Using the constitutive equation (80) and Eq. (91), the BCs (B.1) simplify to the form

$$\left.\begin{aligned}\sigma^0_{ij}n_j-\ell^2\partial_j\big(n_k\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\big)+\ell^2n_j\partial_l\big(n_ln_k\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\big)&=\bar{t}_i\\ \ell^2n_jn_k\partial_k\sigma_{ij}&=\bar{q}_i\end{aligned}\right\}\qquad\text{on}\qquad\partial\Omega\,. \tag{B.2}$$

In addition, BC (B.2a) can be written as [33]

$$\sigma^0_{ij}n_j-\ell^2\big[(\partial_jn_k)\partial_k\sigma_{ij}+n_k\partial_k\partial_j\sigma_{ij}\big]+\ell^2n_j\big[(\partial_ln_l)n_k\partial_k\sigma_{ij}+n_l(\partial_ln_k)\partial_k\sigma_{ij}+n_ln_k\partial_l\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\big]=\bar{t}_i\,. \tag{B.3}$$

If n_i is constant, then the BC (B.3) simplifies to

$$\sigma^0_{ij}n_j-\ell^2\big[n_k\partial_k\partial_j\sigma_{ij}-n_jn_ln_k\partial_l\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\big]=\bar{t}_i\,. \tag{B.4}$$

Using Eq. (169), the BC (B.4) reduces to

$$\sigma^0_{ij}n_j+\ell^2n_jn_ln_k\partial_l\partial_k\sigma_{ij}=\bar{t}_i\,. \tag{B.5}$$

In the limit $\ell\to 0$, the BCs (B.2) reduce to the classical one: $\sigma^0_{ij}n_j=\bar{t}_i$.

Using the "Bifield" ansatz (133), the BCs (B.2) can be decomposed into the classical part for σ^0_{ij} and a gradient part for σ^1_{ij} (see also [69]). In this manner, the classical part of the BCs corresponding to the classical equilibrium condition (131) reads

$$\sigma^0_{ij}n_j=\bar{t}_i\qquad\text{on}\qquad\partial\Omega \tag{B.6}$$

and the gradient part of the BCs corresponding to the field equation (134) is given by

$$\left.\begin{aligned}-\ell^2\partial_j(n_k\partial_k\sigma^1_{ij})+\ell^2n_j\partial_l(n_ln_k\partial_k\sigma^1_{ij})&=\ell^2\partial_j(n_k\partial_k\sigma^0_{ij})-\ell^2n_j\partial_l(n_ln_k\partial_k\sigma^0_{ij})\\ \ell^2n_jn_k\partial_k\sigma^1_{ij}&=\bar{q}_i-\ell^2n_jn_k\partial_k\sigma^0_{ij}\end{aligned}\right\}\quad\text{on}\quad\partial\Omega\,. \tag{B.7}$$

It can be seen in Eq. (B.7) that the classical stress σ^0_{ij} acts also as traction for the gradient part σ^1_{ij}.

If n_i is constant, $\partial_j \sigma^0_{ij} = 0$, $\partial_j \sigma^1_{ij} = 0$ are fulfilled and using the BC (B.6), we find

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \ell^2 n_j n_l n_k \partial_l \partial_k \sigma^1_{ij} &= -\ell^2 n_l n_k \partial_l \partial_k \bar{t}_i \\ \ell^2 n_j n_k \partial_k \sigma^1_{ij} &= \bar{q}_i - \ell^2 n_k \partial_k \bar{t}_i \end{aligned}\right\} \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega\,. \tag{B.8}$$

In addition, if the Cauchy traction $\bar{t}_i$ is constant, then the BCs (B.8) simplify to

$$\ell^2 n_j n_k \partial_k \sigma^1_{ij} = \bar{q}_i \qquad \text{on} \qquad \partial\Omega \tag{B.9}$$

and

$$\ell^2 n_j n_l n_k \partial_l \partial_k \sigma^1_{ij} = n_l \partial_l \bar{q}_i = 0 \qquad \text{on} \qquad \partial\Omega\,. \tag{B.10}$$

Eq. (B.10) is fulfilled if the double traction $\bar{q}_i$ is constant. Thus, for constant vector normal, constant Cauchy traction, constant double stress traction and using the "Bi-field" ansatz the BCs of gradient elasticity simplify to the expressions (B.6) and (B.9). The BC (B.6) relates the Cauchy traction to the classical Cauchy stress tensor and the BC (B.9) connects the double stress traction with the gradient part of the Cauchy stress tensor.

References

[1] F. Bopp, Eine lineare Theorie des Elektrons, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **38** (1940) 345–384.

[2] B. Podolsky, A generalized electrodynamics: part I – non-quantum, Phys. Rev. **62** (1942) 68–71.

[3] B. Podolsky and P. Schwed, Review of a generalized electrodynamics, Rev. Mod. Phys. **20** (1948) 40–50.

[4] D. Iwanenko and A. Sokolow, *Klassische Feldtheorie*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1953.

[5] W.R. Davis, *Classical Fields, Particles and the Theory of Relativity*, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970.

[6] H.-J. Treder, Schwere Photonen in der klassischen Elektrodynamik, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **30** (1973) 229–235.

[7] F. Frenkel, 4/3 problem in classical electrodynamics, Phys. Rev. E **54** (1996) 5859–5862.

[8] R.R. Cuzinatto, C.A.M. de Melo, L.G. Medeiros and P.J. Pompeia, How can one probe Podolsky electrodynamics? Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **26** (2011) 3641–3651.

[9] J. Kvasnica, A possible estimate of the elementary length in the electromagnetic interactions, Czech. J. Phys. B **10** (1960) 625–627.

[10] R.P. Feynman, R.B. Leighton and M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics, Volume II*, California Institute of Technology, 1964.

[11] J. Kvasnica, A remark on Bopp-Podolsky electrodynamics, Czech. J. Phys. B **10** (1960) 81–90.

[12] A.E. Zayats, Self-interaction in the Bopp-Podolsky electrodynamics: Can the observable mass of a charged particle depend on its acceleration? Ann. Phys. **342** (2014) 11–20.

[13] G.A. Maugin, A historical perspective of generalized continuum mechanics, in: Mechanics of Generalized Continua, Advanced Structured Materials Volume 7, Altenbach, H., Maugin, G.A., Erofeev, V. (Eds.), Springer, pp. 3–19 (2012).

[14] R.D. Mindlin, Micro-structure in linear elasticity, Arch. Rational. Mech. Anal. **16** (1964) 51–78.

[15] R.D. Mindlin and N.N. Eshel, On first strain-gradient theories in linear elasticity, Int. J. Solids Struct. **4** (1968) 109–124.

[16] R.D. Mindlin, Elasticity, piezoelectricity and crystal lattice dynamics, J. Elast. **2** (1972) 217–282.

[17] W. Jaunzemis, *Continuum Mechanics*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1967.

[18] N.N. Eshel and G. Rosenfeld, Effects of strain-gradient on the stress-concentration at a cylindrical hole in a field of unaxial tension, J. Eng. Math. **4** (1970) 97–111.

[19] N.N. Eshel and G. Rosenfeld, Some Two-Dimensional Exterior Problems in a Linear Elastic Solid of Grade Two, Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics (ZAMM) **53** (1973) 761–772.

[20] R.A. Toupin and D.C. Grazis, Surface effects and initial stress in continuum and lattice models of elastic crystals, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Lattice Dynamics, Copenhagen*. Edited by R.F. Wallis, Pergamon Press, pp. 597–602 (1964).

[21] R.W. Lardner, Dislocations in Materials with Couple Stress, IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics **7** (1971) 126–137.

[22] M. Lazar and G.A. Maugin, Nonsingular stress and strain fields of dislocations and disclinations in first strain gradient elasticity, Int. J. Engng. Sci. **43** (2005) 1157–1184.

[23] M. Lazar, G.A. Maugin and E.C. Aifantis, On dislocations in a special class of generalized elasticity, phys. stat. sol. (b) **242** (2005) 2365–2390.

[24] M. Lazar, The fundamentals of non-singular dislocations in the theory of gradient elasticity: Dislocation loops and straight dislocations, Int. J. Solids Struct. **50** (2013) 352–362.

[25] H.M. Shodja, A. Zaheri and A. Tehranchi, Ab initio calculations of characteristic lengths of crystalline materials in first strain gradient elasticity, Mech. Mater. **61** (2013) 73–78.

[26] M. Lazar and G.A. Maugin, Dislocations in gradient elasticity revisited, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **462** (2006) 3465–3480.

[27] M. Lazar, Non-singular dislocation loops in gradient elasticity, Phys. Lett. A **376** (2012) 1757–1758.

[28] S. Li and G. Wang, *Introduction to Micromechanics and Nanomechanics*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2008.

[29] N.M. Ghoniem and L.Z. Sun, Fast-sum method for the elastic field of three-dimensional dislocation ensembles, Phys. Rev. B **60** (1999) 128–140.

[30] M. Lazar, On the screw dislocation in a functionally graded material, Mech. Res. Commun. **34** (2007) 305–311.

[31] H.G. Georgiadis, The mode III crack problem in microstructured solids governed by dipolar gradient elasticity, ASME J. Appl. Mech. **70** (2003) 517–530.

[32] H.G. Georgiadis, I. Vardoulakis and E.G. Velgaki, Dispersive Rayleigh-Wave Propagation in Microstructured Solids Characterized by Dipolar Gradient Elasticity, J. Elast. **74** (2004) 17–45.

[33] X.-L. Gao and H.M. Ma, Solution of Eshelby's inclusion problem with a bounded domain and Eshelby's tensor for a spherical inclusion in a finite matrix based on a simplified strain gradient elasticity theory, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **88** (2010) 779–797.

[34] X.-L. Gao and H.M. Ma, Strain gradient solution for Eshelby's ellipsoidal inclusion problem, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **466** (2010) 2425–2446.

[35] B.C. Altan and E.C. Aifantis, On some aspects in the special theory of gradient elasticity, J. Mech. Behav. Mater. **8** (1997) 231–282.

[36] M.Yu. Gutkin and E.C. Aifantis, Dislocations in the theory of gradient elasticity, Scripta Mater. **40** (1999) 559–566.

[37] M.Yu. Gutkin and E.C. Aifantis, Dislocations and disclinations in gradient elasticity, phys. stat. sol. (b) **214** (1999) 245–284.

[38] H. Günther, On a mechanical model of the Bopp-Podolsky potential, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **33** (1976) 448–454.

[39] G.A. Maugin, Nonlocal theories or gradient-type theories: a matter of convenience? Arch. Mech. **31** (1979) 15–26.

[40] R. deWit, The continuum theory of stationary dislocations, Solid State Physics **10** (1960) 249–292.

[41] V.S. Vladimirov, *Equations of Mathematical Physics*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1971.

[42] R.P. Kanwal, *Generalized Functions: Theory and Technique*, Academic Press, New York, 1983.

[43] J.D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd ed., Wiley, New York, 1999.

[44] W.K.H. Panofsky and M. Phillips, *Classical Electricity and Magnetism*, 2nd ed., Addison Wesley, Reading, MA, 1962.

[45] P. Lorrain, D.P. Corson and F. Lorrain, *Electromagnetic Fields and Waves*, 3rd ed., Freeman, New York, 1988.

[46] A. Accioly, Energy and momentum for the electromagnetic field described by three outstanding electrodynamics, Am. J. Phys. **65** (1997) 882–887.

[47] A. Accioly and H. Mukai, One and the same route: two outstanding electrodynamics, Brazilian Journal of Physics **28** (1998) 35–43.

[48] P. Gaete, Some considerations about Podolsky-axionic electrodynamics, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **27** (2012) 1250061 (10 pages).

[49] E. Kröner, *Kontinuumstheorie der Versetzungen und Eigenspannungen*, Springer, Berlin, 1958.

[50] D. Polyzos, K.G. Tsepoura, S.V. Tsinopoulos and D.E. Beskos, A boundary element method for solving 2-D and 3-D static gradient elastic problems. Part I: Integral formulation, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **192** (2003) 2845–2873.

[51] K.G. Tsepoura, S.V. Tsinopoulos, D. Polyzos and D.E. Beskos, A boundary element method for solving 2-D and 3-D static gradient elastic problems. Part II: Numerical implementation, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **192** (2003) 2875–2907.

[52] G.F. Karlis, S.V. Tsinopoulos, D. Polyzos and D.E. Beskos, Boundary element analysis of mode I and mixed mode (I and II) crack problems of 2-D gradient elasticity, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg **196** (2007) 5092–5103.

[53] E.C. Aifantis, On the gradient approach – Relation to Eringen's nonlocal theory, Int. J. Engng. Sci. **49** (2011) 1367–1377.

[54] H.G. Georgiadis and C.G. Grentzelou, Energy theorems and the J-integral in dipolar gradient elasticity, Int. J. Solids Struct. **43** (2006) 5690–5712.

[55] H.G. Georgiadis, I. Vardoulakis and G. Lykotrafitis, Torsion surface waves in a gradient-elastic half-space, Wave Motion **31** (2000) 333–348.

[56] G.A. Maugin, *Material Inhomogeneities in Elasticity*, Chapman and Hall, London, 1993.

[57] V.K. Kalpakides and E.K. Agiasofitou, On material equations in second gradient electroelasticity, J. Elast. **67** (2002) 205–227.

[58] M. Lazar and C. Anastassiadis, Lie point symmetries, conservation and balance laws in linear gradient elastodynamics, J. Elast. **88** (2007) 5–25.

[59] E.K. Agiasofitou and M. Lazar, Conservation and balance laws in linear elasticity of grade three, J. Elast. **94** (2009) 69–85.

[60] C.Q. Ru and E.C. Aifantis, A simple approach to solve boundary-value problems in gradient elasticity, Acta Mechan. **101** (1993) 59–68.

[61] I. Vardoulakis and J. Sulem, *Bifurcation Analysis in Geomechanics*, Blackie Academic and Professional (Chapman and Hall), London, 1995.

[62] I. Vardoulakis, G. Exadaktylos and E. Aifantis, Gradient elasticity with surface energy: Mode-III crack problem, Int. J. Solids Struct. **33** (1996) 4531–4559.

[63] G. Exadaktylos, Gradient elasticity with surface energy: Mode-I crack problem, Int. J. Solids Struct. **35** (1998) 421–456.

[64] B.C. Altan and E.C. Aifantis, On the structure of the mode III crack-tip in gradient elasticity, Scripta Metall. Mater. **26** (1992) 319–324.

[65] G. Barton, *Elements of Green's Functions and Propagation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989.

[66] A.O. Barut, *Electrodynamics and Classical Theory of Fields and Particles*, Macmillian, New York, 1964.

[67] T. Mura, *Micromechanics of Defects in Solids*, 2nd edition, Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht, 1987.

[68] I.N. Vekua, *New Methods for Solving Elliptic Equations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1967.

[69] N. Aravas, Plane-strain problems for a class of gradient elasticity models–A stress function approach, J. Elast. **104** (2011) 45–70.

[70] E.C. Aifantis, On scale invariance in anisotropic plasticity, gradient plasticity and gradient elasticity, Int. J. Engng. Sci. **47** (2009) 1089–1099.

[71] E.C. Aifantis, Non-singular dislocation fields, IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering **3** (2009) 012026 (10 pages).

[72] N. Aravas and A.E. Giannakopoulos, Plane asymptotic crack-tip solutions in gradient elasticity, Int. J. Solids Struct. **46** (2009) 4478–4503.

[73] R. deWit, Theory of disclinations II, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Stand. (U.S.) **77A** (1973) 49–100.

[74] E. Kossecka, Mathematical theory of defects. part I. Statics, Arch. Mech. **26** (1974) 995–1010.

[75] T. Mura, Continuous distribution of moving dislocations, Phil. Mag. **8** (1963) 843–857.

[76] J.R. Willis, Second-order effects of dislocations in anisotropic crystals, Int. J. Engng. Sci. **5** (1967) 171–190.

[77] R. deWit, Theory of disclinations III, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Stand. (U.S.) **77A** (1973) 359–368.

[78] M. Lazar and G. Po, The solid angle and the Burgers formula in the theory of gradient elasticity: Line integral representation, Phys. Lett. A **378** (2014) 597–601.

[79] M. Lazar and H.O.K. Kirchner, The Eshelby stress tensor, angular momentum tensor and dilatation flux in gradient elasticity, Int. J. Solids Struct. **44** (2007) 2477–2486.

[80] R.W. Lardner, *Mathematical Theory of Dislocations and Fracture*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1974.

[81] C. Teodosiu, *Elastic Models of Crystal Defects*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.

[82] E. Kröner, Continuum Theory of Defects, in: Physics of Defects (Les Houches, Session 35). Balian R. et al., eds., North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 215–315 (1981).

[83] A.C. Eringen, On continuous distributions of dislocations in nonlocal elasticity, J. Appl. Phys. **56** (1984) 2675–2680.

[84] A.C. Eringen, *Nonlocal Continuum Field Theories*, Springer, New York, 2002.

[85] A.C. Eringen, Nonlocal Continuum Theory for Dislocations and Fracture, in: The Mechanics of Dislocations. Eds. E.C. Aifantis and J.P. Hirth, American Society of Metals, Metals Park, Ohio, 101–110 (1985).

[86] M. Lazar, G.A. Maugin and E.C. Aifantis, Dislocations in second strain gradient elasticity, Int. J. Solids Struct. **43** (2006) 1787–1817; [Addendum, Int. J. Solids Struct. **47** (2010) 738–739].

[87] M. Lazar, G.A. Maugin and E.C. Aifantis, On the theory of nonlocal elasticity of bi-Helmholtz type and some applications, Int. J. Solids Struct. **43** (2006) 1404–1421.

[88] H. Kleinert, *Gauge Fields in Condensed Matter Vol. II: Stresses and Defects*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1989.

[89] R. deWit, The self-energy of dislocation configurations made up of straight dislocations, phys. stat. sol. **20** (1967) 575–580.

[90] J.P. Hirth and J. Lothe, *Theory of Dislocations*, 2nd edition, John Wiley, New York, 1982.

[91] N.M. Ghoniem, J. Huang and Z. Wang, Affine covariant-contravariant vector forms for the elastic field of parametric dislocations in isotropic crystals, Phil. Mag. Lett. **82** (2002) 55–63.

[92] G. Po, M. Lazar, D. Seif and N. Ghoniem, Singularity-free dislocation dynamics with strain gradient elasticity, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **68** (2014) 161–178.

[93] X.-L. Gao and S.K. Park, Variational formulation of a simplified strain gradient elasticity theory and its application to a pressurized thick-walled cylinder problem, Int. J. Solids Struct. **44** (2007) 7486–7499.